

THE
CHURCH QUARTERLY REVIEW.

N^o CV. OCTOBER 1901.

ART. I.—CRITICISM AND THE ACTS OF
THE APOSTLES.

1. *Encyclopædia Biblica*. Vol. I., p. 37: 'Acts of the Apostles.' By PAUL W. SCHMIEDEL, Professor of New Testament Exegesis, Zürich. (London, 1899.)
2. *A Dictionary of the Bible*. Edited by JAMES HASTINGS, M.A., D.D. Vol. I., p. 25: 'Acts of the Apostles.' By the Rev. ARTHUR C. HEADLAM, Rector of Welwyn, Herts. (Edinburgh, 1898.)
3. *A Dictionary of the Bible*. Edited by Sir WILLIAM SMITH and Rev. J. M. FULLER. Second Edition. Vol. I. Pt. I., p. 25: 'Acts of the Apostles.' By the late Right Rev. JOSEPH BARBER LIGHTFOOT, D.D., Bishop of Durham. (London, 1893.)
4. *Acta Apostolorum sive Lucæ ad Theophilum liber alter*. Editio Philologica auctore FREDERICO BLASS. (Göttingen, 1895.)
5. *Acta Apostolorum sive Lucæ ad Theophilum liber alter, secundum formam quæ videtur Romana*. Edidit FREDERICUS BLASS. (Lipsiæ, 1896.)
6. *Der abendländische Text der Apostelgeschichte und die Wir-Quelle*. Von AUGUST POTT, Adjunkt im Königl. Domkandidatenstift zu Berlin. (Leipzig, 1900.)
7. *Der Aposteldecret (Act. xv. 29) und die Blass'sche Hypothese*. Von ADOLF HARNACK. Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, 1899, p. 150.

And other works.

It is difficult at the present day to define and acquire a right attitude towards criticism, not only in Biblical matters, but

VOL. LIII.—NO. CV.

B

370656

in many other departments of literary investigation. Criticism has a way of being very self-assertive, and shows a confidence in its own conclusions which is hardly consistent with their variability. It is often irreverent. Not merely does it consider nothing too sacred to be free from its attacks—this is, from certain points of view, perfectly legitimate—but also it shows by its manner, not merely its disbelief in, but also its contempt for, established beliefs. It is scornful of those who reject its conclusions, and is inclined to build up a sort of unorthodox orthodoxy, against the antagonists of which it showers the anathemas which come from the consciousness of superior intellectual insight.

Such an attitude naturally builds up an equally determined attitude on the other side. Anyone who is a firm believer in the truth of certain opinions naturally resents an attack which is often virulent and unrelenting. He is told that it is only the outworks or the excrescences of his faith which are in danger; but the attacks are obviously and clearly directed against all that he holds to be essential. He is not prejudiced in favour of criticism, and when he comes to examine it he finds that, although it is quite convinced that most things should be disbelieved, it is not always agreed on the reason for disbelieving. He finds that the same critics who condemn his beliefs are equally confident in condemning the opinions of their predecessors, who in their day attacked established opinions with just the same self-confidence. He begins to wonder, therefore, whether the present phase of criticism may not equally rapidly pass away. He has read Harnack's condemnation of the Tübingen school. He remembers that there was a time, not so long ago, when he was looked upon as inadequately endowed with intelligence because he dissented from its conclusions, and he begins to wonder whether some future critic will not speak as contemptuously of later destructive criticism. He sees how little constructive theology, how little that satisfies the needs of a man's soul and will be a guide to his life, criticism can give. He knows that the world requires a Gospel; and so he hardens his heart and stops his ears, and is resolved to hold tenaciously to what he has received, without taking the trouble to test or to correct it, and he uses the old-fashioned weapons of orthodoxy and anathematizes the heretic.

Yet criticism has its place and its functions, and it is just when it is anathematized that it begins to be dangerous. The present writer remembers a conversation with a Russian

monk
latter
if an
chang
not d
that
the I
Our
Now,
the c
under
none
it is
Russ
which
interp
never
cism
must
opini
sonin
appli

T
belief
with
tende
many
and
most
tion
us an
best
sided
our c
unco
unles
will
healt
ever
reme
the
and
We
again
it wa

monk in which, after some discussion on the Reformation, the latter argued substantially as follows: 'St. Paul says, "Even if an angel from heaven should come down and bid you change the Christianity that I have taught you, you should not do so." Now, you in the Church of England acknowledge that you changed something at the Reformation. We in the Russian Church have never changed anything at all. Our system is the same as it was in the days of the Apostles.' Now, we know that this statement is absurd; we know that the customs of the Eastern Church have been continually undergoing a process of modification, and that the change is none the less real for having been made unconsciously; yet it is only by the use of criticism that the attitude of the Russian monk can be proved to be erroneous. A Church which would refuse to accept the *Pseudo-Decretals*, or the interpolated passages in the *De Unitate* of Cyprian, can never adopt a *non-possumus* attitude to criticism. Criticism can never do its proper work unless it be free, and must be met, when wrong, neither by the suppression of opinion nor by ecclesiastical anathema, nor by *a priori* reasoning, but by its own weapon—'criticism'—more correctly applied.

The function of criticism is to keep religion true. If beliefs are handed down from generation to generation without any check or safeguard, there will be an inevitable tendency for them to become altered and corrupted. In many cases it is just those bodies which are most conservative and are slowest to make an effort to change which alter most rapidly, for there is always going on a steady modification of opinion of which we are unconscious. We none of us are able to grasp religious truth in its entirety; the very best expositions of it that we can make are invariably one-sided; we hand on a tradition necessarily imperfect to our children, and they in turn hand on what they have been unconsciously continually modifying to their children. Hence, unless there is a continual mental effort of self-criticism, there will be a steady process of deterioration. In a normal and healthy society this process is always going on. Whenever it ceases for a time the change becomes rapid, and the remedy required may be violent. The rapid corruption of the Mediæval Church necessarily created the Reformation; and that was a movement preceded by and built on criticism. We are apt to look on the Oxford Movement as a protest against criticism. A protest against certain forms of criticism it was; but it was also itself an appeal to criticism. It was a

condemnation of current religious conceptions in the light of primitive Christianity.

We may now venture to define what criticism does. There is in every Christian nation and in every religious community a current belief. Criticism asks the question: Is this conception true? We may put the question in two ways. We may ask, Is this true Christianity? Examined in the light of the records of the founding of our religion, of the life and teaching of our Lord, and the writings of the Primitive Church, Is what I believe what was then taught? And there will always be some who will go a step further and will ask, Is Christianity true, or in what sense is Christianity true?

The motive for asking the question is not always the same. It may be pure partisanship or a genuine desire for truth. There are some who desire to prove Christianity untrue because they imagine Christian belief is detrimental to human progress, or because they desire to escape from the restrictions of its moral code. There are some, again, who are violently and relentlessly opposed to this or that ecclesiastical system, and will seek for every argument which may be used against it. But it is equally true to say that there are many who are nervously anxious to know whether Christianity be true or not; who, eager to be able to believe in a future life, are wondering whether, after all, it is true that one rose from the dead to convince men of the judgment to come; or who, perplexed by the conflicting and rival claims of different bodies, are seeking some clear guide to show them what they are to accept. So on all sides there is free inquiry in the air, and the inevitable result is that many are perplexed, and many who are not perplexed are anxious.

To what we have written so far there is one objection which we feel may be raised. You have neglected the power and the duty of faith. If a man has faith he neither doubts nor questions his creed; our faith is the source and reality of all religious life. It is quite true that a man of true faith and real religious life, whose convictions are based not merely on evidence, but on personal experience, who knows, because he has felt, the truth of his religion, will not be in danger of being disturbed by these questions, and will regret many discussions which seem to him futile. But the reality of our faith does not, after all, guarantee the whole contents of our creed (for persons of very varied beliefs have been intensely genuine in their faith), nor make our religious convictions necessarily correct. Earnestness does not make us infallible.

It sh
of th
that
value
other
with
most
that
with
I
healt
mind
pure.
be a
just
sedul
demr
meth
dema
and I
be re
Bibli
truth
state
mora
the
whos
with
and
publ
to qu
to w
mind
forwa
It de
coun
all th
I
pedi
strict
to de
work
both
amon
the

It should be those who know most certainly the importance of their religion to their life who should be most careful that their creed is true, and that they are not injuring the value of the message that they are attempting to teach to others by allowing their own mental indolence to mix up with it what is not of its essence. It is just the man who is most loyal to the Christian faith who will be most anxious that its influence should be least hampered by having mingled with it what is not part of Divine revelation.

If our reasoning be correct, criticism is an essential and healthy element in every religious system and in every human mind. It is the process by which religious belief is kept pure. We have no right to regret its existence. It must be able to work freely, for otherwise it will be probably just what is most open to its attacks that will be most sedulously guarded from it. It must be met, not by condemning its doubts, but by criticizing them by its own methods. But there are some things which may be justly demanded. A critic must be honest, he must be reverent, and he must have a strong sense of responsibility. He must be reverent because he ought to realize that he is dealing, in Biblical matters, directly or indirectly with the fundamental truths of life. The questions at issue, the belief in a future state and in a judgment to come, the religious sanction of the moral law, the spiritualization of the whole of human life by the Incarnation, are of transcendent importance. No one whose mind and judgment deserve to be heard should deal with such matters without the deepest feeling of reverence, and without a full sense of responsibility. To recklessly publish guesses which are little more than 'happy thoughts,' to question everything, without reason or without judgment, to write as if the only object was to shock the more orthodox mind, to show neither discretion nor hesitation in putting forward novelties, is not good scholarship nor wise criticism. It does not in any way further the cause of truth; it discounts the value and results of sober criticism, and defeats all the objects for which free inquiry really exists.

In our last number we gave some account of the *Encyclopædia Biblica*. How far it may fall under any of these strictures we must leave to others to determine. We propose to devote ourselves to what we believe to be a more practical work. We believe that a good deal that has been written both in that volume and in other places has created a certain amount of vague uneasiness with regard to the writings of the New Testament, and more especially the words of our

Lord. There is often a dogmatic assertiveness which may not be justified, but demands examination. We propose to devote a certain number of articles to examine carefully recent criticism on the New Testament, and to try and estimate its value. We cannot profess to be altogether without prejudice in our investigation, although we do not believe that we are any more prejudiced than those who seem so anxious to destroy. There is, moreover, one scientific presupposition which we feel that it is justifiable to hold. Christianity is a fact; its teaching, its early history, the records of its founder are facts. No theories, no criticism, no reconstructions are tenable or possible which fail to explain its origin. Even if all the early history and literature concerning it are condemned as fabulous, the fact of its existence remains. Unless those who reject our current beliefs are able to give some adequate account of how a phenomenon otherwise unparalleled in history came into being, we shall certainly be justified in showing some hesitation about accepting their conclusions. It will take a great deal to make us believe that myths alone are in themselves an adequate cause of Christianity.

We propose to begin with the study of recent criticism on the Acts of the Apostles, and completeness demands that we should say something about the text. There is, perhaps, a tendency among us to lay too much stress on textual problems. Common sense as well as scholarship naturally demands that we should take some care that we possess the document which we are studying in the form in which it was written, and there we must begin. But it is easy to become absorbed in the minutæ of texts, and we may find that life has slipped away before we have time to explain what has been so laboriously constructed. Yet, as our readers know well, the textual problems of the Acts are full of interest. Practically we possess the book in two forms. In the Vatican MS. and allied authorities we have a short, concise, well-written narrative; in the Codex Bezae and certain other MSS., although not always consistently, we have the same narrative, but the style is more lengthy; there are constant paraphrases, additions of words or phrases, sometimes even of new matter. The former text is that represented by Westcott and Hort's edition, and lies at the basis of the Revised Version. The latter, generally if erroneously called the Western Text, has been edited for us by Professor Blass. What are the relation and origin of these two? In the year 1895 the last-mentioned scholar, Professor of Classics in the University

of Ha
which
St. Lu
His ex
mend
of car
that
tenab
have
to us
passa
and
later
up b
well-
in th
cond
of hi
thes
that
thes
prin
the v
read
and
scho
fact,
com
has
hyp
rece
thos

own
To
pres
rep
the
wro
aut
cor
typ
a t
par
cas

of Halle, published a very remarkable edition of the Acts, in which he revived the theory that the larger edition represents St. Luke's rough copy and the shorter edition his own revision. His exposition was brilliant and the theory had much to recommend it; but for the past five years it has been the subject of careful and elaborate investigation, and the examination that it has undergone does not, we believe, make it more tenable. Some leading scholars, such as Professor Zahn, have indeed accepted it, but the balance of argument seems to us against it. Professor Harnack has studied a number of passages in a series of papers read before the Berlin Academy, and his conclusion is that the Western Text is in all cases later and derived. The arguments against it are well summed up by Mr. Page in an appendix to the last edition of his well-known Commentary on the Acts; and Professor Schmiedel in the article on the Acts in the *Encyclopædia Biblica* has condemned it at a length quite out of proportion to the rest of his article. Our own examination has convinced us that these criticisms are sound; but it must not be overlooked that the problem is complicated by the fact that the hypothesis of Blass has been labelled 'apologetic.' One of the principal arguments in favour of it is the belief that some of the variants of the Western Text, equally with the ordinary reading, imply the hand of an eye-witness. It presupposes and supports the Lucan authorship. This has not induced scholars in this country to be too eager in receiving it; in fact, most of the criticism against it here that we have seen comes from those who accept St. Luke's authorship, but it has made some Continental critics very severe. When an hypothesis has been labelled apologetic it is in danger of receiving that scant measure of justice which is meted out to those who are held to be conservative critics.

Before we pass on to wider problems we may express our own conclusions concerning the results of textual criticism. To justify them in detail would not be consistent with our present purpose. The text as edited by Westcott and Hort represents substantially but not absolutely the text as it left the author's hand. The English editors have probably been wrong in rejecting some of the readings contained in the authorities called Western, for these MSS. (although much corrupted) represent an independent tradition from the archetype. Western readings apart from these are corruptions of a type quite normal in ancient literature; they are glosses, paraphrases, corrections; are early in origin, and in some cases the result of translation. This early origin makes them

indirectly a testimony both to the comparatively early date of the text and to the possibility of attaining it in a pure form. We have no right or justification in a difficult passage to assume the existence of glosses or corruptions to explain difficulties.¹ Moreover, as far as we can see, there is no support for the attempts that have been made—a brilliant one is that contained in the work of Pott we have placed at the head of our article²—to connect the variations with any theory of sources. Whatever was the date of the Acts, it came in a definite literary form from one author, and the variations of the MSS. are the result of the faults or misfortunes of later copyists, to a large extent the product of a time before the book had been definitely received as Scripture and its text had become accepted as something sacred.

We pass to the more important questions. Who was the author of the Acts of the Apostles? The ordinary answer is St. Luke. There is a definite proof with certain definite stages.³ It is admitted almost universally that the third Gospel and the Acts are by the same author, even in the form in which we possess them. The next stage is based on the 'we' sections. We are accustomed to accept the argument as on the whole fairly satisfactory, which explains the existence of these sections by the hypothesis that the author of the Acts was one of St. Paul's companions who accompanied him during certain portions of his journeys, and that the change of person is thus accounted for quite naturally. Let us now hear how Professor Schmiedel in the article already referred to in the *Encyclopædia Biblica* treats this argument:

'The section in which, as an eye-witness, the writer gives his narrative in the first person plural (xvi. 10-17; xx. 5-15; xxi. 1-18; xxvii. 1-xxviii. 16) may be implicitly accepted. But it may be regarded as equally certain that they are not by the same writer as the other parts of the book.'⁴

There is a tone of certainty about these words which is

¹ A very unnecessary instance is contained in a note by Mr. G. A. Simcox in the *Journal of Theological Studies*, Vol. II., July 1901, p. 586. It is perfectly easy to evade and escape every difficulty and prove anything if we are at liberty to treat any passage which conflicts with our own theories as a gloss. Only, if we have reason for suspecting our text to be so bad, it is not worth while to trouble ourselves about the matter at all.

² A very careful examination of this theory will be found in the *Journal of Theological Studies*, Vol. II., April, 1901, p. 439, by Mr. A. V. Valentine-Richards.

³ It may be found worked out in detail in Bishop Lightfoot's and Mr. Headlam's articles in the two Bible dictionaries.

⁴ *Encyclopædia Biblica*, i. 37.

absolutely unjustifiable from a scientific point of view. An opinion at variance with this is held not only by authorities such as Bishop Lightfoot, who would probably be dismissed by Professor Schmiedel as an apologist, but whose learning and judgment are obviously of far greater weight than are his own, but also by Renan and Harnack. What right has Professor Schmiedel, then, to be so certain? Does he not realize that he is writing in a manner which will make any thoughtful scholar look upon his judgment as worthless. It would be perfectly legitimate for any Christian apologist to maintain the thesis that St. Paul wrote the Epistle to the Hebrews, and if his arguments were good they would demand respectful attention; but if he began by asserting that the Pauline authorship was certain he would be looked upon as a writer who did not know what he was talking about. Professor Schmiedel does not deserve any greater indulgence or leniency. An apologist may normally demand the same scientific accuracy of statement that he is expected and desires to show himself. At any rate, he may look for some solid and substantial argument to justify this sweeping statement. Professor Schmiedel considers thirty short lines sufficient for his purpose. The following is the remainder of the passage:

'In the sections named the book shows acquaintance with the stages of travel of almost every separate day, and with other very unimportant details (xx. 13; xxi. 2, 6; xxviii. 11); outside these limits it has no knowledge even of such an important fact as that of Paul's conflicts with his opponents in Galatia and Corinth, and mentions only three of the twelve adventures catalogued so minutely in 2 Cor. xi. 24 f., cf. 23 (Acts xiv. 19; xvi. 22-23 f.). Even had the writer of the book as a whole (assuming him to have been a companion of Paul) been separated from the Apostle—remaining behind, *e.g.*, in Macedonia, during the interval between xvi. 17 and xx. 5—he would surely afterwards have gathered the needful details from eye-witnesses and embodied them in his book, instead of satisfying himself with such extraordinarily meagre notes as we have in xviii. 21-23, xx. 1-3, and xvi. 5-8. Even were he following an old journal he could never have passed over so many important matters in silence simply because they were not to be found in his notes. Further, he contradicts the Epistle to the Galatians so categorically that if we assume his identity with the eye-witness who writes in the first person, we are compelled to adopt one of two courses. We must either make Galatians non-Pauline or pronounce the writer of Acts as a whole to be a "tendency" writer of the most marked character.'¹

¹ *Encyclopædia Biblica*, i. 37.

We hardly think that this passage, which is considered sufficient, will appeal to our readers as very conclusive. Surely, the difference in detail between the 'we' sections and other parts of the Acts is just exactly what we should expect if the author was present in the one case and dependent upon second-hand information in the other cases. Professor Schmiedel does not seem to realize the ordinary hypothesis which, to our mind, adequately explains the facts. The author of the Acts joined St. Paul at Troas, and accompanied him to Philippi; there he was in company with him during the earlier events recorded, but was not himself put in prison. He remained at Philippi, of which place he was perhaps a native, until St. Paul returned there, and was one of those who accompanied him to Jerusalem and Rome. During the remainder of the Acts he was St. Paul's companion. Those events during which he was with St. Paul, notably the shipwreck, he describes in the first person plural; those events, such as the audiences of St. Paul before Felix and Festus, when if present he was only a spectator, he narrates, as was natural, in the third person. The difference in detail will surely be adequately explained in this way, and in this way only, and the many hypotheses as to sources which profess to find traces of the 'we' sections in other parts of the book are thus quite inconsistent with the facts. But, further than this, the argument from silence or from omission is surely most unsubstantial. Let us suppose for a moment that all the twelve adventures enumerated in 2 Cor. xi. 24 were described in the Acts. Would not Professor Schmiedel have at once argued that the writer had the passage before him, and had inserted these adventures so as to harmonize with it? It is obvious that much of St. Paul's life has been passed over or touched on very shortly, and that for two very sufficient reasons. The first, that the author did not consider the facts relevant to his purpose. He passes very lightly over the events in xviii. 21-23, xx. 1-3, and xvi. 5-8, because the apostle was merely going over old ground. It is quite possible that he knew very little about the troubles in Galatia and Corinth; but, in any case, it was quite unnecessary to refer to them, as the whole question had been settled, so far as the Church as a whole was concerned, in the discussion at Jerusalem. A second reason was that of space. The author of the Acts was as much limited in space by the size of a papyrus roll as is the writer of an article in this Review by the demands of the Editor. He naturally selected those incidents which were most important, or on which he had

special
which
there
up in
during
length
nothin
preven
St. Pa
But
and th
charac
definit
Jerusa
seem
difficu
becaus
used l
would
histor
Galati
is obv
own i
book
disagr
of tha
to see
to aim
It
the se
St. Pa
of the
refer
funda
at on
event
certa
opini
that a
then,
Jerus
the a
he te
1 T
visit i

special knowledge. Completeness was impossible, and criticism which demands it is absurd. When we write a biography there are often years of a man's life which may be summed up in a few words. We may have known a person well during his later years, and be very slightly acquainted with lengthy periods during the early part of his career. There is nothing in the omissions which on any rational theory will prevent the whole work from being by a companion of St. Paul.

But it is argued that the contradictions between the Acts and the Epistle to the Galatians are fatal to the historical character of one or the other, and reference is given most definitely to the same writer's article on the Council of Jerusalem. The subject has been often discussed, and may seem to many tedious, but we are bound not to shirk any difficulty that there may be. It is more necessary to do so because the methods of historical criticism which are often used by Biblical critics seem to us to be of a character which would be looked upon as quite inadmissible in profane history. The interpretation of the first two chapters of the Galatians bristles with obscure points. Where the meaning is obviously uncertain we have no right to claim that our own interpretation is certainly correct, and then accuse the book of the Acts of being historically valueless because it disagrees, not with the Galatians, but with our interpretation of that Epistle. The ordinary and natural process would be to see how far the two narratives illustrate one another, not to aim at interpreting them so that they differ.

It is well known that the fifteenth chapter of the Acts and the second chapter of the Galatians both describe a visit of St. Paul to Jerusalem and discussions concerning the position of the Jewish Christians. It is argued that these two narratives refer to the same event, and that the discrepancies are so fundamental that both cannot be historical. We might state at once that it is not yet proved that they refer to the same event, and if they do not all difficulty vanishes.¹ We have certainly no right to be positive, but we may express our own opinion that they are identical; and, at any rate, we will take that as the most unfavourable hypothesis. The first difficulty, then, is, Why does St. Paul not mention the second visit to Jerusalem recorded in Acts xi. 30, xii. 25? We will give the answer in Professor Schmiedel's own words. St. Paul, he tells us, 'was bound in the interests of truth to mention

¹ This is, for example, Professor Ramsay's opinion. He identifies the visit in Galatians ii. with that recorded in Acts xi. 30, xii. 25.

all the occasions on which he had come in contact with the original Apostles.¹ As the Acts tell us definitely that on that occasion it was the presbyters that he saw, and introduces a narrative which explains why, about that time, Peter, and probably other Apostles, had retired from Jerusalem, there is nothing to prevent us from assuming that St. Paul on that occasion did not come in contact with any of the Apostles. In this case, on Professor Schmiedel's own showing, it would not have been necessary for him to mention the visit.

We pass now to the two narratives. It is obvious that the whole purpose of the two is different. The Acts is a formal account of what the author looked upon as an epoch-making event in the history of the Church. He gives a narrative of a great public debate. In the Epistle St. Paul has merely to state the results of the visit so far as they bear on the points at issue with the Galatians, and it is not his business to give a full account of both the public and private meetings. On this point Professor Schmiedel does not find a discrepancy. 'So far there is no inconsistency between Galatians and Acts; both knew of meetings of both kinds.'² Where, then, does the difficulty come in? The answer is in the decree:

'The crucial question, however, is, was any final decision arrived at in a public assembly? If the decision was not in Paul's favour, the claims of truth and of prudence alike must have led him to mention it. Much, however, of what is recorded in Acts—e.g. the speech of Peter (xv. 7-11)—points very clearly to a decision in Paul's favour; and to pass this over in silence would have been folly. The picture, therefore, in Acts of a decisive public assembly is entirely incorrect.'³

We may make the point quite clear. In Gal. ii. 6 St. Paul says that they who were of repute imparted nothing to him. It is argued that, therefore, the decree contained in the Acts could not have been passed. Here, then, we have the point at issue. Is St. Paul's language in Galatians consistent with this formal decision? We believe it is. St. Paul tells us (Gal. ii. 2) that he laid before (*ἀνεθέμην*) those who were of repute the Gospel that he preached to the Gentiles; that is, his scheme of Christianity, including of course salvation through Christ and the needlessness of performing the works of the law. He then goes on in ver. 6 to tell us that those who were of repute imparted to him nothing in addition (*προσἀνέθεντο*). This is exactly true. The conference

¹ *Encyclopædia Biblica*, i. 916.

² *Ibid.* i. 920.

³ *Ibid.*

accepted
was not
and so
Jewish
well hav
even if
issue.
that to
Christia
Schmied
done.
What h
that the
need to
the sake
be right
the sort
that the
for salva
individu
suit thos
there wa
to idols,

Then
might c
doubt th
the Acts
dictions.
first of a
the Acts
agreeing
weight
criticism
between
attitude
in the A
believe
honestly
from th
formidal
that the
to repre
they rem
Church
Galatian

accepted the position that if a man desired to be saved there was no need to keep the law. They added certain moral and social observances which were necessary for enabling Jewish and Gentile Christians to live together. These may well have been part of what St. Paul had enjoined before, but even if they were new they did not touch the main point at issue. At any rate, the Epistle to the Corinthians shows that to abstain from things offered to idols was the normal Christian custom. St. Paul does not there, as Professor Schmiedel seems to think, allow it, or say that it may be done. He assumes that the Christian conscience forbids it. What he does say is that it may be perfectly true, as is argued, that the matter is not wrong in itself, and that there is no need to be over-scrupulous and make inquiries, but that for the sake of others even the most extreme scrupulousness may be right (1 Cor. viii. 13). The whole argument implies just the sort of position created by the decree. A recognition that the social customs and law of the Jews are not necessary for salvation, but that in certain matters the Church and the individual Christian must regulate their conduct in a way to suit those who had been brought up in Jewish prejudices. If there was no decree forbidding the eating of things offered to idols, why did any difficulty arise on the question?

There are many other questions of detail on which we might discuss Professor Schmiedel's views. There is no doubt that there are differences between the language of the Acts and Galatians, but the differences are not contradictions. It is necessary in order to make them discrepancies first of all to find an interpretation which is inconsistent with the Acts, and then to condemn the latter document for disagreeing with our own interpretation. But what really lends weight to all this minute criticism—in our opinion, hyper-criticism—is the belief that underlies it, of a strong antagonism between Jewish and Gentile Christianity, and between the attitude of St. Paul and the older Apostles which is ignored in the Acts. Looking at the question, then, broadly, we believe that so far as this antagonism existed, it is quite honestly recognized and described by the Acts. We learn from the fifteenth chapter that the Judaizing party was formidable; we learn from the words of the decree (xv. 24) that they claimed, as we also gather from St. Paul's Epistles, to represent the Church at Jerusalem; we learn also that they remained until the end a powerful element in that Church (Acts xxi. 20). If we turn to the Epistle to the Galatians we learn that St. Paul's position was definitely

accepted by the older Apostles, and although on one occasion he has to rebuke St. Peter, it is because he was acting inconsistently with his former conduct and professions. We have no evidence of any fundamental antagonism. But we have, we would submit, further evidence for the complete victory at an early date of the freedom of the Gospel in the subsequent history of Christianity. We know from Justin Martyr that there existed in his time bodies of Judaizing Christians, but they are quite outside the ordinary currents of Church life. There is no evidence of any doubt on the points at issue existing within the Church. There is, moreover, absolutely no evidence of any controversy on the subject within the Church after the days of St. Paul. The evidence has to be invented by putting at a later date documents which claim to belong to an earlier period. All evidence that we have represents this period of conflict as over, and Catholic Christianity (as it is sometimes called) as definitely accepted. This would not have been possible if there had been unsolved questions left for the next generations, and if the other Apostles had not in substance accepted the position which we know of as that of St. Paul. For the Church at large these problems, as the Acts represent, were concluded; for a few years the extreme faction continued to exist in Jerusalem, as we know from the Acts, and emissaries from them troubled the churches founded by St. Paul. St. Paul completed his theological argument in the Romans, which has the tone of being written after the conflict is over. By the time of the Epistles of the Captivity new troubles are beginning to arise, and by the end of the century, when Clement of Rome writes, the whole question of works and faith was so remote as to be largely incomprehensible. After the Council of Jerusalem Judaizing Christianity existed only for those who naturally clung to the Jewish observances in which they had been brought up. After the fall of Jerusalem Jewish Christians became only a sect.

The argument so far has been to prove that there is nothing in the narrative of the Acts inconsistent with its authorship by a companion of St. Paul, that in fact, its composition at a later date could have been hardly possible. Let us now ask whether we have any strong positive arguments. There is one test—we believe, a decisive one—to which we may bring the question. We will start with a quotation from Professor Schmiedel:

‘But there is one charge from which [the author of the Acts] cannot be freed, viz. that he has followed the method of retaining

the “
whom
style,
lack o
Chron
actual
work o

Pr
the w
langu
langu
remain
risk o
10-12
taken
how r
a ver
that v
once
words
throu
St. L
shoul
times
verse
times
καὶ
times
ἐνθ
then
auth
one v
the A
word
only
but i
times
occu
elsew
used
ὁ νόμ
Luke
six ti
times

the "we" without change. In the case of so capable a writer, in whom hardly a trace can be detected, either in vocabulary or in style, of the use of documents, this fact is not to be explained by lack of skill, such as is sometimes met with in the Mediaeval Chroniclers. The inference is inevitable that he wished—what has actually happened—that the whole book should be regarded as the work of an eye-witness.¹

Professor Schmiedel admits a complete unity of style in the work. If anyone will take the trouble to examine the language of the 'we' sections, he will find that both in language and expression they are absolutely at one with the remainder of the Acts and with the third Gospel. At the risk of being tedious we will take a single section, Acts xvi. 10-17, and examine the vocabulary. Those who have not taken the trouble to work out the subject will hardly realize how marked is the style. In verse 10 the word *δραμα* seems a very obvious one, and we are somewhat surprised to find that while it occurs eleven times in the Acts we only find it once elsewhere in the New Testament. The remaining words in the verse are quite commonplace and are used throughout the New Testament, but they are all common in St. Luke's writings—*εὐαγγελισασθαι*, for example, which we should not pick out as a special word, occurs twenty-five times in Acts and Luke and only twenty-one elsewhere. In verse 11, *ἀναχθέντες* occurs in this particular sense thirteen times in Acts and twice in St. Luke, not at all elsewhere; *κἀκεῖθεν* nine times in Acts and once elsewhere; *ἐπιούση* five times in Acts, not at all elsewhere. There is one word, *εὐθυδρομήσαμεν*, which is peculiar to the 'we' sections, but then it could only be used of a sea voyage of which the author had exact details. In the next verse there is only one word distinctive, *διατρίβοντες*, which occurs nine times in the Acts and once elsewhere; *οὗ* seems a very ordinary word, but it occurs fifteen times in Luke and Acts, and only twelve times elsewhere; *νομίζειν* seems ordinary Greek, but it occurs nine times in Luke and Acts and only six times elsewhere; *συνελθεῖν* seems an ordinary word, but it occurs seventeen times in Acts and Luke and only fourteen elsewhere, and of these eight are in 1 Corinthians, where it is used technically of attending divine service. The expression *ὀνόματι* in this sense occurs twenty times in Acts, six in Luke, and only three elsewhere; *σεβόμενος τὸν Θεόν* occurs six times in Acts, and not elsewhere; *διανοίγειν* occurs seven times in Acts and Luke, once elsewhere. The author of this

¹ *Enc. Bibl.*, i. 39.

section has just the same love of compound words as the author of the Acts: *παραβιάζεσθαι* (once in Luke), *παρ-ακολουθεῖν* (once in Luke); *ἐργασίαν* occurs in Acts and Luke five times, elsewhere once; *παρίχειν*, Acts and Luke nine times, elsewhere seven; *καταγγέλλειν*, Acts eleven, elsewhere six. The only unusual words are *μερίς*, *κολωνία*, *προσεύχη*, *πορφυρόπωλις*, *πίθωνα*, and *μαντευομένη*, all of which are obviously technical expressions which would be used rightly here and not elsewhere. In the narrative there is not the slightest trace of change of vocabulary, or change of style; with the exception of the change of persons, the whole flows on quite uninterruptedly.¹

Now how can we explain this? Perhaps the writer introduced the first person for the sake of deception, and invented these sections as well as the others. But if he did so how does it happen that he managed to make just these sections so lifelike and detailed? But, perhaps, as Professor Schmiedel suggests, he incorporated these sections from a diary, and carefully avoided changing the person. But he must obviously have rewritten the whole most carefully as the unity of style shows. Can we really believe that he in the most elaborate manner rewrote the whole of that section in his own style (as Professor Schmiedel would have us believe) without obliterating any of the characteristic touches which proclaim the eye-witness and yet preserved the first person for the sake of deception? Surely no sober critic is likely to believe that. But the ordinary and common hypothesis is the most natural one: that the writer of the whole work is also the author of the 'we' sections, and that he quite naturally, and perhaps almost unconsciously, uses the first person in describing those incidents which happened when he was with the Apostle. To the vast majority of historical students this explanation will seem to be the only one that explains adequately all the facts. It is significant of the bias with which Professor Schmiedel writes, that while he refers to this unity of style in order to bring what we believe to be a quite gratuitous accusation of deliberate deception against the writer, he totally ignores and does not even think it necessary to deal with the argument from it for unity of authorship which has appealed to a long line of able critics as convincing. There is no fairness, nor any power of seeing both sides of an argument. He is not a critic, he is a partisan.

Granted that the author of, at any rate, the 'we' sections,

¹ See *Hore Synoptica*, by the Rev. Sir John C. Hawkins, pp. 13 f.

was a
says
is the
Schmi

'T
Col. iv
of the
(Acts x
Jewish
among
abando
compar

W
third
studen
that th
cumci
not re
the da
They
day o
after t
tion o
keep t
becaus
not co
were a
Paul o
and cu
him ha
any re
Prosec
gogues
going
of the
consist
others
As
very w
to imp
From
party
panied

was a companion of the Apostle, who was he? Tradition says St. Luke; St. Luke also satisfies the conditions, and is the only known companion who does. But Professor Schmiedel is naturally not satisfied with this.

'The most suspicious fact is that whilst Luke, if we may trust Col. iv. 11, 14, was, like Titus (Gal. ii. 3), uncircumcised, the writer of the Journey Record not only uses Jewish specifications of date (Acts xvi. 13, xx. 6 f., xxvii. 9) and goes to the synagogue or the Jewish place of prayer (xvi. 16), but also includes himself (xvi. 13) among those who taught there. . . . We must thus, perhaps, abandon all attempt to ascribe the Journey Record to any known companion of Paul.'¹

We have little doubt that the author of the Acts and the third Gospel was a Gentile Christian who was a diligent student of Jewish history and customs, and we do not doubt that the passage referred to implies that St. Luke was uncircumcised; but we fail to see why one who was not a Jew should not refer to Jewish fasts and feasts where they represented the dates which regulated the movements of his companions. They went to the *Proseuche* on the Sabbath, because on that day others would come there; they sailed on their journey after the days of unleavened bread, because the Jewish section of the party, and St. Paul among them, would naturally keep the feast. So he also mentions the fast in Acts xxvii. 9, because it was observed in some form by St. Paul, who did not come forward with advice until the religious ordinances were accomplished. Both these references imply that St. Paul did not personally throw off the religious ordinances and customs in which he had been brought up, and which for him had become part of his ordinary habits. Nor was there any reason why he should not accompany St. Paul to the *Proseuche*. Gentiles were not excluded even from the synagogues, and there would be nothing to prevent him from going with St. Paul and his companions to the meeting-place of the very small Jewish community, which seems to have consisted almost entirely of women, and there engaging with others in conversation.

As against these arguments, which do not appear to us as very weighty, we may mention one small point which seems to imply that the author of the 'we' sections was a Gentile. From chapter xxi. we gather not only that he was of the party which went up to Jerusalem, but also that he accompanied St. Paul when he visited St. James and the Elders

¹ *Encl. Bibl.*, i. 44.

(xxi. 18); but when, in v. 26, he proceeds to describe the manner in which St. Paul carried out the advice that had been given him, and visited the temple, he definitely implies that he was not with him. No doubt he was one of the Greeks mentioned in ver. 28, although he carefully suppresses his own name. We feel that there is still no reason for refusing to accept St. Luke as the author.

So far we have examined the arguments by which Professor Schmiedel has attempted to overthrow what we venture to consider the established theory—namely, that the author of the Acts was a companion of St. Paul. We will now suggest three additional reasons for thinking that it must have been written not later than the first century. The first is the relation to the Pauline Epistles. This is an argument on which Professor Harnack lays great stress; he writes as follows:

‘On the other side there are two considerations which make it unadvisable to go beyond the last years of Domitian’s government. In the first place, although the author is acquainted with the preaching of St. Paul (xiii. 38 ff.), the Pauline letters are not used either as sources for the history, or as material for the teaching, and there is not a single letter the use of which by the author can be proved. . . . The fact is most remarkable, inconceivable in my opinion, if the author wrote in Asia Minor, Greece, Macedonia, or Rome, and is an urgent reason for not going beyond the first century. Consider how intimately [Clement], Barnabas, Ignatius, and Polycarp are acquainted with the Pauline Epistles, and how constantly they use them. The expedient that the author has not wished to use them owing to his tendency, is untenable, both as regards his teaching (Acts xiii. 38, 39), and undoubtedly so as regards the narrative.’¹

Let us hear now what Professor Schmiedel has to say on this subject:

‘The total influence of all these tendencies not having been so great as to lead the author wholly to disregard the matter supplied to him by tradition, it has often been supposed possible to affirm that he had no such tendencies at all. The inaccuracies of the book are in this case explained simply by the assumption that the writer was not in possession of full information, and that in a naïve yet still unbiassed way he first represented to himself the conditions of the apostolic age, and afterwards described them as if they had been similar to those of his own, when the conflict of tendencies in the primitive Christian Church had already been brought to an end. Certain it is that in his unquestioning reverence for the Apostles, it was impossible for him to conceive the idea of their having ever been at variance with one another. On the other hand, it cannot possibly

¹ Harnack, *Die Chronologie der Altchristlichen Literatur*, i. pp. 248, 249.

be de
accour
them.
this w
Parado
acquai
panion
accept
times.
times l
before
be fam
with w
prepar
spuriou
unhisto
charge
Only,
adhere
his sou

TI
curiou
before
of St.
little a
thinks
He re
Paulin
any re
point
with a
truth,
purpos
the P
he sho
them
in ph
left, th
of the
knowl
had n
A
develo
more
cient

be denied that he must at the same time have either passed over accounts that were very well known to him or completely changed them. It is hard to understand how any one can airily say that to this writer, a Paulinist, the Pauline Epistles remained unknown. Paradoxical as it sounds, it is certainly the fact that such a lack of acquaintance would be more easily explicable had he been a companion of Paul (a supposition which, however, it is impossible to accept) than it is on the assumption that he lived in post-apostolic times. It is conceivable, though not probable, that Paul might sometimes have been unable to communicate his epistles to his companions before sending them off. But a companion of Paul would at least be familiar with the events which are recorded in the Epistles—events with which the representation in Acts is inconsistent. If we are not prepared to declare the whole mass of the Pauline Epistles to be spurious, and their statements about the events to which they allude unhistorical, there is no way of acquitting the writer of Acts from the charge of having moulded history under the influence of "tendency." Only, this tendency must be understood as being simply a consistent adherence to the view of the history that he had before he studied his sources.¹

The whole of this paragraph is to our mind exceedingly curious. It is both acute and perverse. But it clearly puts before us the two alternatives. If the writer was a companion of St. Paul, it is comprehensible that he should have shown so little acquaintance with the Epistles. But Professor Schmiedel thinks it inconceivable that he should have been a companion. He recognizes, therefore, that the author must have known the Pauline Epistles, and that he deliberately refrained from making any reference to documents which were inconsistent with his point of view. Now, it is perfectly conceivable that a writer with a thesis to defend, and a complete disregard for historical truth, should have altered or omitted what did not suit his purpose; but what is inconceivable is that if he wrote when the Pauline Epistles had begun to be treated as authoritative, he should have shown no certain trace of acquaintance with them by a single quotation, or a single definite resemblance in phraseology. That is to our mind impossible. We are left, then, with the only possible alternative, that the author of the Acts, being a companion of St. Paul, obtained his knowledge, not from the Epistles, most of which probably he had never seen, but from personal intercourse.

A second line of argument might be chosen from the undeveloped theological language. We shall have to speak more of this, perhaps, on another occasion. It will be sufficient at present to mention only one point. If we take the

¹ *Encl. Bibl.*, i, p. 42.

text of the Revised Version or of Westcott and Hort, we shall find that the name *Χριστός* is hardly ever used as a personal name; it is almost always a title. The writer shows that he belongs to a generation which recognized that it was still necessary to prove that Jesus was the Messiah. There may be one or two cases where the word has become, or is becoming, a personal name, but they are doubtful. Now compare this phraseology with that of such an early writer even as Clement of Rome.¹ By that time Jesus Christ or Christ will be used almost as we use either, and the old point of view is being forgotten. We do not like to speak with certainty, but we imagine much help in dating early Christian literature may be found in a careful examination of technical theological language.

A third argument may be based, we believe, on the complete absence of any reference to monarchical episcopacy. But on this point we must hear Professor Schmiedel again:

'If Acts xx. 18-35 has many ideas in common with those of the Pastoral Epistles, the indiscriminate use of *πρεσβύτεροι* and *ἐπίσκοποι* (xx. 17, 28) shows that the author has not yet reached the stage in the development of Church government which characterises the First Epistle to Timothy, the latest of the Pastoral Epistles, which wishes to see the Bishop, conceived of as a sole ruler, and represented in the person of Timothy as apostolic vicar, set over the presbytery (1 Tim. v. 1-19). The date of the Acts must, accordingly, be set down as somewhere between 105 and 130.'²

This extract will, like many others we have given, supply abundant food for reflection. When Christian literature has been arranged in a manner quite different from what we are accustomed to consider possible, it may oblige us to go very far forward to find some common ground to stand on. However, we may take it that Professor Schmiedel recognizes that there are no signs of a developed episcopacy in the Acts; we may take it, again, that he considers the Church organization, as presented to us, is less highly developed than that in the Pastoral Epistles, or, at any rate, in 1 Timothy. If this much be admitted, we must state that to us it is quite impossible on purely scientific grounds to put the Acts later than the end of the first century, or, in fact, so late. Our starting-point must be the Ignatian letters, and let us remember that it is now quite impossible for Professor Schmiedel, if he pays any regard to critical literature, to ignore them or place them at a very late date. They cannot be placed much later than the

¹ Cf. Clem. Rom. i. 24, 36, 38, 46, &c.

² *Enc. Bibl.* i. 49.

we shall
personal
that he
was still
ere may
ne, or is
l. Now
ly writer
Christ or
old point
eak with
Christian
technical

the com-
iscopacy.
again :

ose of the
ἐπίσκοπος
e stage in
erises the
es, which
presented
resbytery
ly, be set

n, supply
ture has
t we are
go very
. How-
izes that
acts ; we
nization,
at in the
his much
ossible on
ne end of
oint must
t is now
ays any
them at
than the

age of Trajan. No one who reads them can doubt that they represent a very marked development on the Pastoral Epistles. To account for such a difference in the same locality there must be at least a generation. We cannot, in arguing with Professor Schmiedel, assume the genuineness of anything. But as the Pastoral Epistles are quoted by Polycarp, and as they represent a point of view clearly earlier than Ignatius, and as the Acts are certainly not later in their reference to organization than the Pastorals, it is impossible to put St. Luke's writings later than the close of the first century. For our part, we feel confident that as the stages of Church history are more clearly marked out, and as the undeveloped character of the language of the Acts is more clearly examined, it will become constantly more difficult to place the date later than the year 80. Most of the definite dates for later Christian literature accepted by Professor Harnack may be considered certain, and it thus makes much that Professor Schmiedel writes antiquated and valueless. He, like some of his friends, will persist in remaining blind to results which have already undermined his position.

Let us try and sum up our argument so far as it has gone. We have confined ourselves to going over rather well-known ground. In the face of a renewed attack, we have felt the need of asking ourselves whether the old arguments which made us believe that St. Luke was the author of the Acts must be given up. We have found the assailant acute and minute in his methods and very self-confident, but we have not found anything very formidable. We find old prepossessions which we have long ago convinced ourselves are unhistorical about the parties in the early Church ; we find a great deal on the other side quietly ignored ; we have found criticism which will not support what is expected of it. We do not, therefore, feel any hesitation in adhering to our old beliefs, and we remember that they have received very considerable authority on their side in recent years. In old days we could quote Renan as accepting the Lucan authorship ; now we may record how Professor Ramsay, who had originally accepted Tübingen theories, found himself driven to this conclusion by archæological investigation ; how Professor Blass, a classical scholar, has come fresh to the study of the work with the methods learnt in profane literature, and how in vigorous and racy Latin he laughs at the cobwebs which the theologians, *i.e.* those whom we should call the critics, have spun—an offence for which he will never be forgiven ; and how Harnack has put 93 A.D. as the *terminus*

ad quem for the Lucan writings. We have thus two lines of argument—one for early authorship, one for apostolic authorship; and they combine to make us feel confident that St. Luke was the author of the Acts, and to think that it must have been written between the years 65 and 80. More precisely than this we do not at present feel inclined to fix the date. We have here a solid historical point gained, and this settles for us approximately the date of St. Luke's Gospel, and probably also that of St. Mark.

We must in conclusion guard our readers, still more our critics, from thinking that we claim to do more than we have done. The authorship by St. Luke is quite compatible with deficiency in historical accuracy, and with an incorrect conception of at least the earlier periods of Christian history. There are still many questions left for discussion. We hope that we may be able at some future time to turn to these, and we are glad to look forward to able assistance in our attempt. One thing more we hope that we may have done, and that is made our readers feel that they need not be too anxious to trust, or too ready to fear, Professor Schmiedel. We have allowed him to speak for himself. We have, we believe, treated him perfectly fairly, and we doubt very much whether our readers will be inclined to listen to him more patiently than we have done.

ART. II.—FATHER HECKER AND AMERICANISM.

The Life of Father Hecker. By the Rev. WALTER ELLIOTT. Second Edition. (New York, 1894.)

THE name of Father Hecker has been of late somewhat prominent in Roman Catholic circles, especially in America; and not unknown among Anglicans in England. He and the Society of St. Paul, which he founded, have been assailed and venerated as the source of the movement called 'Americanism.' The aim of that movement is to find room within the strictest obedience to the Holy See for individual liberty and national spirit. It ought not to be confused with that so-called 'Liberal Catholicism,' of which the tendency is more or less to limit the claims of ecclesiastical authority. Hecker has no affinity to those Roman Catholics who, if Mr. Mivart's account be trustworthy, accept the letter of Catholic doctrine,

while
deism
fallib
is tha
also t
each
itself.
infall
thoug
vidua
out t
Rom
by a
the F
God
cipli
havin
of he
foste
whic
M
out t
him
and
anot
conf
sary
beco
may
whil
The
poss
histo
give
to h
clica
Bish
incr
rath
culc
the
the
ture
tion
the

while reading into it a meaning which is little else than deism. On the contrary, he accepts from the heart the Infallibility of the Pope and all that it involves. But his thesis is that God's inspiration is given not only to the Church but also to the individual, and that, as the inspiration comes in each case from the same source it must be consistent with itself. It is therefore the conviction of Hecker that the infallible Church is not so much the restrainer of individual thought from vagaries as it is the atmosphere in which individual thought will most luxuriantly grow. If it is pointed out to him that this is not a correct description of the modern Roman Church, which has certainly not been distinguished by a liberal air of inquiry or action, his answer is that, since the Revolution of the sixteenth century, the task assigned by God to the Roman Church has been the perfecting of discipline in order to exclude heresy; but that, her discipline having been completed by the declaration of the infallibility of her head, she can now turn her attention to the task of fostering the development of individualism and nationalism, which she was forced for a time to lay aside.

No genuine Anglican Catholic can view this theory without respect and sympathy. His own experience has taught him to value the liberty of individual thought which he enjoys, and he will desire the extension of it to his brethren in another part of the Lord's family. At the same time, he will confess that there is among ourselves a sad lack of the necessary discipline, in the absence of which liberty is apt to become licence; and he will not grudge the wish that Rome may be enabled to gain that which England has enjoyed, while preserving that which England has greatly lost. The reconciliation of liberty and order cannot indeed be impossible, since God inspires both. Yet he thinks that the history of the Roman Church since the decree of infallibility gives little support to his wish. That decree does not seem to have been the starting-point of a renewed liberty. Encyclicals do not breathe the spirit of freedom; and Roman Bishops do not seem to use their powers of repression with increased caution. Obedience to the system of St. Thomas rather than the imitation of his intrepid spirit has been inculcated on the Church; and a ready censure has fallen on the heads of the few theologians who have dared to study for themselves the problems of the composition of Holy Scripture, or the light which modern history throws on the question of Anglican Orders. Free inquiry is not stimulated by the knowledge that delators are always at hand to accuse

whatever is new as certainly untrue, at the bar of a Congregation of probably not very learned Italian prelates. Our own attention was first called to the subject of Hecker's movement by the first (we hope it was also the last) number of a journal called the *True American Catholic*, which purposes to 'protect the true Catholic faith from the infernal machinations of a sect, who, under the name of Americanism, attacks and attempts to destroy the real foundations of Christianity.' 'This infernal sect . . . has as much Catholicism in it as Mohammedanism has Christianity;' its leader, Archbishop Ireland, who contributes a preface to the work before us, is a 'millionaire Bishop without conscience and without religion;' and even Cardinal Rampolla is charged with being bribed with 'the American yellow metal.'¹ Since this interesting journal appeared, Americanism, Hecker, and Ireland have been acquitted or condemned by the supreme authority, according as men please to interpret the rather vague dictates of infallibility; but if they have been acquitted it was on the express ground that they were not guilty of any freedom of thought. Nor, indeed, do we find in Hecker's life any instance of that liberty of which he is represented as the champion, except that his Community shared the freedom of the Oratorians as to solemn vows, that he encouraged the singing of vernacular hymns, and that his language was not that of a trained theologian, a character which never belonged to him, but that of racy American common sense. When we read the remarks of the journal to which we have referred, we hoped to find Hecker an original thinker, and we were disappointed; but we were not wrong in thinking that a man whom such a writer condemned was probably a good and sincere man. We found him, indeed, a man of serious limitations; but we felt ourselves enriched by the contemplation of a noble character, and were instructed as to faults in our own Communion which we, at least, are free to confess and try to amend. And our desire to share our interest and profit with our fellow-Churchmen leads us to offer the result of our studies to them.

In the year 1800, a brass-founder named John Hecker migrated from Prussia to New York. There he married Caroline Freund, failed in business, and died in 1860. Their third son, and fourth and last child, Isaac Thomas, was born in 1819. From his mother, a woman of excellent sense and deep devotion, who became a Methodist, he received religious impressions which endured through all his life; and from his

¹ *The True American Catholic*, Roma, February 4, 1899.

childhood he had a consciousness of 'having been sent into the world for some especial purpose' (p. 8). His early education was interrupted by his father's lapse into poverty; and about the age of eleven he began to work under his brothers in a bakery. Baptismal grace, the influence of a good mother, and the discipline of hard work, preserved his childhood from wrong; and in later days he could tell a friend that 'he had never used drink in excess, never sinned against purity, never told a lie; and he certainly never was dishonest' (p. 11).

The person who, next to his mother, exercised the greatest influence over the lad, was a Dr. Brownson, once a Unitarian minister, and a friend of Channing. Under his guidance young Hecker threw himself with characteristic zeal into the movement for social and commercial reform. The persons with whom he was associated revered our Lord as the model social Reformer, while they had little or no faith in Him as the Son of God, the Redeemer of men, and the Source of Divine Life. To them Hecker owed (p. 26) a gradual change in his view of Christ, which was gain as well as loss: 'Until then the Saviour of men had been represented to him exclusively as a remedy against the fear of hell: His use seemed to be to furnish a Divine point to which men might work themselves up by an emotional process resulting in an assurance of forgiveness of sin and a secure hope of Heaven' (p. 26). It was a gain when he learned to regard our Lord as the Regenerator of society, even though the time was not yet come for him to discern in Him not the Deliverer from penalty but the Saviour from sin.

In his zeal for social reform, Hecker joined one of those social colonies which form so interesting a feature of American life. These are usually associated with Spiritism, or some other esoteric doctrine; but at Brook Farm, in Massachusetts, there was no such bond. The members included Protestants of all sorts and a few Roman Catholics. They were not socialists in a technical sense, but they shared a common table, and contributed to the common stock, not money, but such labour and instruction as each was able to bring. Without a creed, they regarded Christ as their pattern, and aimed at embodying, so far as they understood it, His kingdom. The author of Hecker's *Life* gives generous testimony to the benefits received by the half-educated young man from the refined and intellectual conversation, the pure and high aims, and the partial experience of life in community which he enjoyed at Brook Farm. Hecker himself, though at this time he did not profess faith in the Son of God, was deeply

in earnest in his search after God, strict in his conduct, instant in prayer, an ascetic vegetarian in his diet. He already recognized celibacy as the form of life to which he was called, though his reverence for human nature saved him from the Gnostic disgust for marriage which has entangled many such theorists; and, in fact, there is evidence that in his twenty-fifth year he was greatly attracted by some lady whom his biographer, with commendable reticence, does not attempt to identify.

The desire to overcome this attraction, and the craving for a less pleasant form of life, drew Hecker, after some seven months, to remove to a similar community founded at Fruitlands by Bronson Alcott, whose name is best known in England by the charming stories written by his daughter. Of Alcott and his egotistic conceit Hecker formed a very unfavourable impression; and after two months he returned to New York, and to a share in his brothers' now prosperous business. But trade was not congenial to him. He does not seem to have discovered the way in which commerce can be carried on to the glory of God. He continued his philanthropic schemes; but his great concern was with the development of his own soul, with which he found even philanthropy hardly consistent. At a later date he writes: 'Thank God! He led me into the Catholic Church. If it hadn't been for that I should have been one of the worst cranks in the world' (p. 102); and there is reason to think his estimate of himself just. Yet there is, to our mind, something infinitely pathetic in his diary written at this time. It shows the young, half-educated tradesman, safeguarded by no Catholic tradition, unsupported by any Creed, strengthened by no Sacraments, yet earnestly seeking God and His Face, and, according to the promise, not seeking in vain. He speaks of the 'constant presence of invisible beings who affect my sensibility, and with whom I converse, as it were, in thought and feeling, but not in expression' (p. 110). Those who are acquainted with the more devout side of Spiritism are not unfamiliar with such sights. We are among those who regard Spiritism as a perilous rushing into regions which God has opened to us only through His Son come in the flesh; and we believe that a man who, disregarding the Incarnation and the extensions of it in the Church and the Sacraments, seeks commerce with spirits, is not only in danger of wilful deception, but is also likely to fall into the snares of Manicheism. But this conviction does not cause us to forget that many of these seekers are earnest and devout in their search after God, and

deser
recei
of m
pres
ill as
that
pare
more
not l
nized
to th
appr
or d
I
men
mon
poin
falle
the
whic
and
and
teac
enjo
enal
use
apti
plan
fulfi
—th
he c
fig-
a b
orig
not
fect
reas
and
Hin
Spi
Acc
Ma
bad
bra
def

deserve a more appreciative treatment than they are likely to receive from a priest who has not studied their peculiar form of mysticism. It has been the happy but arduous task of the present writer to deal with a number of such persons; and, ill as he has discharged this ministry, he feels bound to regret that in the Anglican Church he has found few who are prepared to deal with them at all. In this respect Rome had more to offer Hecker than England. To her credit, she has not been oblivious of the varieties of spiritual life, has recognized that abnormal tempers and experiences are not alien to the religion of the Incarnation, and has provided more appropriate help than that of treating the unusual as fatuous or dangerous.

By this time young Hecker had discovered the fundamental reason of his discontent with Protestantism. In common with Moehler and Mozley, he regarded as the starting-point of Lutheranism the doctrine of the total depravity of fallen man. There are few more emphatic warnings against the exaggerated use of religious language than the way in which Luther's zeal for the declaration of man's sinfulness and need of grace led him to rebel against Catholic tradition and indeed Christian morality. The Catholic tradition teaches that man was created not only innocent but in the enjoyment of such a presence of the sanctifying Spirit as enabled him to bring forth fruits well pleasing to God. To use a figure, the fruit-tree was not only created with an aptitude for producing fruit after its kind, but it was also planted in a climate in which that aptitude could have its fulfilment. By the Fall, man lost that gift of the Holy Spirit—the tree was transplanted to a cold and barren soil; but he did not forfeit the nature with which he was created—the fig-tree, though it could no longer ripen figs, did not become a bramble. Accordingly, there are in fallen man traces of his original righteousness—a reason not entirely blinded, a heart not wholly selfish, a will not altogether captive. Above imperfection, indeed, he cannot rise, but his virtues are not for that reason unreal. In every nation there are those who fear God, and work righteousness, and are, therefore, acceptable to Him; though they need the renewed presence of the Holy Spirit to ripen the fruit which else remains immature. According to Luther, the ruin was far more fundamental. Man's nature itself was changed, so that it became essentially bad: the fig-tree was not only starved, but turned into a bramble; the golden chalice was not only battered and defiled, but converted into lead. Whatever apparent virtues

remained in the man were only fallacious—'splendid sins.' So entire was man's corruption that nothing remained in him to which the Holy Spirit could appeal, and on which He could work for the restoration of real holiness. Salvation, then, was not the making man righteous, but the reputeing of him as righteous; and justifying faith was not the response of the soul to the power of Divine Life brought within its reach, but the mere acceptance of delivery from the due reward of sin on the score of the substituted Death of Christ.

It is not easy for us to realize that this was the ground-idea of Protestantism. In England, perhaps, the land of compromises, it was never very widely held. Rather, our national tendency has been towards a sort of Pelagianism, which thought that man was quite competent without grace to be as good as he need be; though this modern Pelagianism differs from the ancient for the worse, inasmuch as self-reliance taught the old Pelagians to strive hard for the virtue of which they held themselves competent, whereas the modern doctrine lowers the requirements of God to that which man can easily attain. But we must remember that Hecker was not an Englishman, but a German; and the Germans, a speculative race, have held much faster to the scholastic foundation of Protestantism. To Hecker, an intelligent and generous man, this doctrine of total depravity was a libel on humanity. He had known many men who made no profession of religion, yet lived a virtuous and noble life. Was he to call their virtue a delusion? If even he, with limited powers of perception and love, could see much in these men to approve and honour, was it possible that the tender eye of God could see in them nothing that was not loathsome? The very foundation of the constitution of his country claimed for men rights which could not belong to abject degradation; and Hecker learned a more generous theology from Washington than from Luther.

We find him, then, alienated from the sect in which he had been brought up, and for a time attached to no religious body. But he was too consistent in his belief in the inspiration of man to be content to remain, like Emerson and others, permanently outside all Churches. The social instinct is too noble a part of man for him to dream that the Holy Spirit, who inspires the individual, has no inspiration for society. Nor, again, could he be content with a sect which should be organized just to embody the tenets of its founder. Such a sect is, after all, no more than a projection of its founder's mind on a larger scale; and, individualist as he was, Hecker

perce
wide
man
it w
vers
nee
sion
nor
cern
ratio
the
and

His
imp
both
sinc
muc
exp
only
can
and
hav
con
take
allo
easi
and
sim
is n
eng
the
sur
imp
Con
bish
in p
We
dog
asse
no
inv
stu
for
WI

perceived that the individual could only develop in a society wider than himself. If the Christian religion is more than man's conjecture about God, it requires a witness to receive it wider than the individual; universal truth involves a universal recipient. More generous than Emerson, he felt the need of a society in which truth should be a common possession. As the individual and the State are neither identical nor mutually exclusive, but mutually supporting, so he discerned the necessity of a religious Society in which the inspiration of the individual should flourish. The Church and the individual must be no more antithetical than the nation and the individual, but complementary.

In this theory we hold that Hecker was entirely right. His error seems to us to lie in his failure to see that in a very imperfect world defects have to be taken into account on both sides. Suppose that all Christians were perfect saints, sincerely desiring to know God, and entirely obedient to so much as they know of Him, then it would be reasonable to expect also a perfect Church, accepting the same revelation, only in a more extended form, inasmuch as many minds can receive fuller truth than any single mind. Perfect men and a perfect Church would balance each other. But we have to deal with very imperfect men, full of indolence, conceit, unfaithfulness. We have found Hecker disposed to take too generous a view of humanity; and his biographer allows (p. 420) that he may be justly charged with 'too easily crediting unworthy men who prated to him of liberty and the Holy Spirit.' To our eyes he seems to show a similar credulity with regard to the Roman Church. There is no indication that he ever engaged, or was competent to engage, in a serious investigation of the Roman claims at the bar of Holy Scripture, history, or reason. There is surely something of audacity when a young tradesman, imperfectly educated, not yet a member of the Roman Communion, nor decided to enter it, 'told' an Anglican bishop that 'though the Church of Rome may commit errors in practice, she had not committed any in principle' (p. 136). We are inclined to ask what knowledge of history or of dogmatic theology enable him to make this rather bold assertion, while he was yet an inquirer. Indeed, there are no signs that at any part of his life he engaged in a serious investigation of the matter. He was, no doubt, an earnest student of the Bible for purposes of edification, but of study for the purpose of theological illumination there is no record. When he does quote a text to establish the infallibility of

the Church he misquotes it; for he renders her Founder's promise that 'the gates of hell should not prevail against her' as a promise that 'the gates of hell should never prevail against her.' To some readers there seems to be between Christ's words and Hecker's interpretation all the difference that there is between final victory and perpetual immunity—between resurrection and exemption from death. As regards the appeal to history, we are far from saying that the verdict is unambiguous, or that it lies entirely on the one side or the other; but we complain that we see no sign that Hecker himself ever acted on the principle, stated by him near the end of his life, that 'no man can intelligently become a Catholic without examining and deciding the historical question;' and we apprehend a wide ingress for rationalism in the proposition with which he continues: 'Back of this is the consideration that the truths the Church teaches are necessarily in harmony with my reason—nay, that they alone solve the problems of reason satisfactorily, and answer fully to the wants of the heart' (p. 128). There is a good deal of difference between 'reason' and 'my reason'; and a person who enters the Church on such individualistic grounds is not unlikely to leave it on similar grounds when he thinks it does not answer to his personal needs.

To Hecker the Anglican communion does not seem to have offered much attraction. It will be remembered that it had no ancestral claim on him, a German by descent and character. Nor, indeed, had she very much to commend her. She had always called herself episcopal, but in America, from the time of the early colonists until 1784, she had been without bishops. By a ridiculous fiction America had been deemed part of the diocese of London. The discipline, or rather the lack of it, had been what might be expected: the clergy were few, for ordination could only be obtained by a long and costly journey to England, on which one-fourth of those who essayed it might expect death by shipwreck, pirates, or disease. We ought to pay our deep respect to the struggling Church for having sent any men on this arduous mission, when we remember that in our colonies at the present day hardly a man is to be found who presents himself for Holy Orders, and those prosperous and independent communities are content to lean on England for their supply of clergy. Confirmation, which was greatly disused in England, was impossible in America. The appeal of the colonies for an episcopate, for which the prudence of Archbishop Laud had made provision in 1638, was rejected

by the
did
Go
whol
grow
Cass
of th
many
intro
stood
Angl
unpa
term
whic
only
Refor
attra
servi
societ
its de
Sakra
abdic
the C
weste
and v
Churc
found
inspir
schism
of Ch
action
thus
liberty
blame
our fa
and sh
have l
At
baptis

¹ F
indebt
Plantin
McCon
history
tone is,

by the very different bishops of the Hanoverian period, who did not accept St. Peter's opinion that they 'ought to obey God rather than men.' Yet it would be unfair to cast the whole blame on the bishops of that generation, who had grown up in a tradition of allowing the interference of Caesar in the things pertaining to God. Nor was the demand of the colonies for bishops by any means unanimous, for many even of the clergy dreaded that an episcopate would introduce the whole system of Establishment as it was understood in England. In the struggle for independence the Anglican Church had placed herself, on the whole, on the unpatriotic side. Her unhappy adoption of the ambiguous term 'Protestant' in her title had encouraged the impression, which there was little in her practice to dispel, that she was only one of the many sects which had sprung up at the Reformation. There was little in such a society as this to attract a stranger like Hecker, beyond the beauty of its services, which he always admired. He could not love a society which seemed to commit itself to Protestantism, with its degrading doctrine of total depravity, which kept the Sacraments in a corner, which had never claimed or had abdicated the claim to be the national Church. The light of the Catholic revival had indeed begun to shine on the western shores, and Hecker was for a short time attracted; and we are tempted to wonder whether, if his search for the Church had taken place fifty years later, he would not have found his home in a communion which believes itself to be inspired but not to be infallible, which owns the fact of schism and does not dissemble its share in the general sin of Christendom, which encourages individual thought and action while holding fast to the tradition of the Creed, and thus goes some way towards the desired reconciliation of liberty and authority. That he did not find this home is no blame to him; but it is surely no slight blame to us and to our fathers, whose timid reticence as to the Catholic Faith, and shameful subservience to the powers of the world, may have lost to the Anglican Church so admirable a convert.¹

At last Hecker's decision was made. His conditional baptism in the Roman Church took place in 1844. In the

¹ For details about the Anglican Communion in America we are indebted to the *History of the American Episcopal Church from the Planting of the Colonies to the End of the Civil War*, by the Rev. S. D. McConnell, D.D. (New York, 1890). This admirable and lucid short history may be compared to the work of Mr. Wakeman; though its tone is, to us, not quite so satisfactory.

following year he journeyed to Belgium, in order to join the ranks of the Redemptorist Fathers.

The Congregation of the Most Holy Redeemer was founded in 1742, by S. Alfonzo Liguori, with the object of reclaiming by means of missions the people of the kingdom of Naples, who were sunk in ignorance and vice. It had been extended to Northern Europe a few years later by S. Clement Hofbauer, who, like Hecker, had begun life as a baker. His immediate successors had established the Novitiate at S. Trond, in Belgium, between Brussels and Liège. Hither came Hecker with two companions; and the American novices caused their superiors no little perplexity by continually asking why this thing was forbidden, that permitted; and Hecker, especially showed a boldness of speculation on metaphysics and ethics which was at least unconventional. On one occasion, when he was engaged in his regular thanksgiving after Communion, 'suddenly God stopped him, and he was told not to pray that way any more.' It seemed as if the Divine Voice spoke to him: 'Cease your activity. I have no need of your words when I possess your will. 'Tis I, not you, who should act . . . I cease to act when you begin, and begin to act when you cease' (p. 209).

We have no claim to speak with authority on the secret matter of the soul in prayer; yet we venture on a few remarks on this topic, because it seems to illustrate the character of Hecker, and the influence of scholasticism on spiritual philosophy. It is the weakness of scholasticism that it tends to distinguish things which are essentially identical. To borrow a phrase, it tends to accentuate differences of species into differences of genus. In the present case, we should maintain the generic identity of all sorts of prayer. In all sorts there are two constituents—there is the presence of the Holy Spirit, without whom no prayer can ascend, and there is the co-operation of the human mind. The key of the mystery is in the Incarnation, in which human nature is seen, not passive under the sway of the Divine Personality, but actively co-operating therewith. To talk of a 'passive state of prayer' is, to our mind, to use language which has a monophysite ring about it; and it may be remembered that competent writers have detected a monophysite tone in the Roman denial of the reality of the natural substances in the Holy Eucharist,¹ and in the denial of a human and fallible side to the Church. There are, indeed, moments when the consciousness of the Holy Spirit praying within us is so

¹ Gore, *Body of Christ*, p. 113.

over-
opera
Pres
realiz
must
as tes
God
revea
has
Hims
enem
co-op
that
ignor
tende
in the
a less
had f
no of
other
self-a
patibl
men s
them
rules.
In
this d
help i
found
as nei
some
a test
Roma
She e
often
we de
Hecke
the ch
sense,
habits
We do
it did
would
men, a
were a
VOL

overpowering, that there seems no place left for the co-operation of man; just as there are moments when the Presence of our Lord in the Blessed Sacrament is so vividly realized that the outward signs seem to vanish. But we must jealously remember that impressions are not to be taken as tests of reality. It would be fatal to forget that, though God be All in all, yet the 'all' in which He dwells and reveals Himself is no phantom, but a real thing, which He has endowed with being in order that He might reveal Himself in it. Is there not, perhaps, something of the old enemy, total depravity, lurking in this denial of human co-operation in the highest form of prayer? We think, then, that Hecker's guides were wise in distrusting his tendency to ignore, in this respect, the human side of prayer. This tendency was not, indeed, in accordance with his usual belief in the dignity of the creature; but possibly it was related to a less admirable side of his character, which his individualism had fostered—the opinion that he was called to a work which no other man could do, and must be led by paths which other men could not tread. We do not need any very deep self-analysis to remind us that conceit is by no means incompatible with religion, and that there is for the very holiest men some danger of a sort of spiritual hysteria, which makes them view themselves as interesting exceptions to general rules.

In the discipline which was necessary for dealing with this danger we are free to confess that Hecker found more help in the Roman Church than he would probably have found in the English. It is the natural effect of a schism that, as neither party carries off all the good, so each party has some advantages over the other. We shall never consider it a test of loyal Anglicanism to deny that in some respects the Roman part of our Lord's family is superior to ourselves. She excels us in the systematic training of souls. We too often deal with them in the rough-and-ready way in which we deal with technical education. If a young man with Hecker's peculiar character were to apply to an English priest, the chances are that he would be set before the bar of common sense, advised to avoid all that was peculiar in his religious habits, and directed to the discipline of dry parochial work. We do not think such treatment would be entirely amiss. If it did not alienate him it would very likely brace him; but it would tend to reduce him to a level conformity with other men, and to deprive him of his natural characteristics. If he were a saint he might rise above this depressing discipline,

and even be stronger for the repression ; but in most cases he would lose that peculiar tone of spiritual character which is as desirable in the concert of the Church as a variety of instruments is in an orchestra. There is an unfortunate narrowness in our field of clerical life, which leads to monotony of character : very few of our clergy are trained to anything else than the routine of parochial duty. The Roman Church is wiser in this respect. She opens careers of usefulness to men who have not the gifts which make a good parish priest. She provides a sphere for those who are called to a life of contemplation or to the almost exclusive service of the pulpit or the confessional. If Hecker had been an Anglican, he would no doubt have made an excellent parish priest, but it would have been at the cost of all that was individual in him. In the Roman Church his special gifts found a special place : a tradition of spiritual training developed (not without danger, indeed) that which was peculiar in him ; he felt that he was so far understood that he was not forced into an uncongenial mould ; he became the founder of an important religious Order and movement.

His novitiate ended in 1846 ; Hecker was transferred to the House of Studies at Wittem, in Holland. And here he suffered from the recurrence of a mental trouble which had affected him four years before : 'Study became impossible,' and he felt a 'strong inclination to doze and slumber' (p. 145). He himself attributed this trouble to supernatural influences ; but we imagine that a physician would assign, as the cause, his nervous tension, insufficient food and diminished sleep. In this way his friend Brownson regarded the matter, giving him wise advice not to indulge in reverie, but to command himself ; and now his superiors at Wittem seem to have taken a similar view. To a temperament like Hecker's the drudgery of study was naturally distasteful. He wished to see for himself, and it was irksome to spend time on learning what other people had seen. Though he was a considerable reader we do not think he was ever a student. He had little aptitude for methodical reading, for weighing evidence, for correcting or amplifying his own views by those of others. Many a clever schoolboy has the same distaste for study, which a wise tutor corrects by urging on him that his own perceptions of truth are necessarily imperfect, and need enlargement by the knowledge of the perceptions of others. It would be wise to inquire in such cases, as always when a person thinks himself exceptional, whether there is not some conceit which takes the guise of a special call. Of

such
ridic
denie
woul
disap
bably
at C
riors
than
H
Ame
began
preac
and f
like
true
bad m
from
they
For v
gion
good
eloqu
the p
matte
self, a
same
H
lessen
Indee
natur
natur
anxi
it sho
speak
comm
living
his br
views
infrin
imme
No m
not co
groun
in clos

such a defect there may be some trace in his sensitiveness to ridicule (p. 208), and his almost comical distress at being denied a holiday and told off to 'clean the stair-way.' 'It would nearly kill me to obey,' he says, later, 'such was my disappointment, grief, and humiliation' (p. 208). It was probably not a bad discipline for him that, alike at Wittem and at Clapham, whither he was sent in 1848, most of his superiors seem to have treated his peculiarities as faults rather than inspirations.

Having been ordained priest by Wiseman, he returned to America in 1851. And now the active period of his life began. The chief occupation of the Redemptorists is the preaching of missions, alike for the conversion of non-Catholics and for the edification of the faithful. 'To practical people like Americans there is no oral or written evidence of the true religion so valid as the spectacle of its power to change bad men into good ones. Such a people will accept arguments from history and from Scripture; but those of a moral kind they demand: they must see the theories at work' (p. 238). For work of this kind Hecker was admirably fit. His religion was real, and he had a keen zeal to make his hearers good. He was, indeed, no deep theologian, nor was he an eloquent orator—and a person who frequently heard him tells the present writer that his sermons were often lacking in matter; but he was a man of prayer, who knew God himself, and used a gift of homely speech to bring others to the same knowledge.

His submission to the Roman Church did not in any way lessen his attachment to the nation to which he belonged. Indeed, Brownson and others thought his estimate of the natural virtues of American citizens too optimistic. It was natural that he and those who were under his influence were anxious that, when a new house was to be founded at Newark, it should be distinctly nationalist in tone, with English-speaking fathers, who should have their own language in common use. But of this desire the Rector of the Order, living in Rome, was suspicious; and Hecker was deputed by his brethren to visit Rome in 1857, in order to urge their views upon the authorities. His journey was regarded as an infringement of the vows of obedience and poverty; and immediately on his arrival he was expelled from the Order. No more serious charge was made against him; and we are not competent to discuss the justice of his expulsion on such grounds. It will be remembered that Rome at that time was in closest league with despotic governments, and at war with

a nationalist movement at home. It will be remembered also that, about the same date, Wiseman was engaged in controversy with the Redemptorists, whose conservatism led to the establishment of the Oblates of St. Charles. Hecker's cause was warmly espoused by Cardinal Barnabò; and Pius IX., who was never wanting in shrewdness, took the wise step of releasing all the American Fathers from their vows as Redemptorists, and permitting them to form a new Congregation immediately subject to the Holy See. The new society was established in 1858, under the name of the Missionary Priests of St. Paul the Apostle, and Hecker was chosen the first Superior.

The wisdom of the course thus taken seems to us obvious. The unity of the faith does not imply identity of temper. In the conduct of a Religious Order there must be cases in which an American will reasonably take a different view from an Italian; and there are cases in which the opinion of persons living on the spot is better than that of Superiors living at a distance. And the possibility of strain is increased rather than diminished by modern facilities of communication. When letters were slow, and personal visits rare, a considerable discretion was necessarily left to subordinates at a distance. It was so in secular matters, when a general or a governor was entrusted with a task, and left almost without supervision in the execution of it. Now the telegraph follows him to the field or the province, and he can hardly take an important step without reference to home. Hecker was not a man who could work under constant interference. He had an intense belief in the guidance given to the individual, and in secular matters, as in spiritual, his 'first and fundamental rule of direction was to have as little of it as possible' (p. 321). His ideal of the Paulists was 'a body of free men who love God with all their might, and yet know how to cling together' (p. 291). How far this ideal has been realized in the Community can hardly be tested by the work which lies before us—it is too much of a eulogy to impress us as unbiased. That there were trials and difficulties in the new society is only to be expected in any labour for the glory of God; yet it is only by chance references that we hear of their existence, and of their details we possess nothing. It was, no doubt, a work of delicacy to narrate Hecker's mistakes of 'too easily crediting unworthy men who prated to him of liberty and the Holy Spirit,' while those men themselves might be still living, and when the writer might have been a partner in the fray. To say that Father Elliott is

not t
chag
men
prude
lack
That
Amer
to us
it has
Rome
It
labour
paper
discer
Unite
work
Procu
theolo
sangu
largel
stanc
this d
uncer
At an
and
accep
urged
lay sp
tion o
extern
of the
to the
soul'
tion b
urge t
theolo
on 'th
the de
Fr
and h
was b
failing
victim
charac
depre

not the best of witnesses in such a matter is by no means to charge him with disingenuousness; for the most sincere of men may fail to see certain facts, or may be restrained by prudence from narrating them. Yet we are hampered by the lack of further information than that which he gives us. That the Society has been rich in efforts to make the great American nation obedient to Christ is beyond doubt; and to us this is a more important matter than to know whether it has succeeded in being loyal at once to liberty and to Rome.

It would be tedious to relate at length Hecker's various labours, alike in preaching and in publishing books and newspapers. It was natural that a man of his shrewdness should discern and use the important influence of journalism in the United States. In 1869 he was called from his ordinary work to attend the Vatican Council in the double capacity of Procurator for Bishop Rosecrans, of Columbus, Ohio, and theologian to Archbishop Spalding, of Baltimore. With his sanguine temper he hoped that the Council would legislate largely for the general needs of the Church; whereas circumstances limited it to the definition of Papal Infallibility. In this dogma he was a believer; but his biographer leaves it uncertain whether he regarded the definition as opportune. At any rate, the air of controversy was distasteful to him, and he left Rome three months before the decree. He accepted the decision heartily. The Roman Church, he urged, had been driven by controversy with Protestantism to lay special stress on the principle of authority. 'The definition of the Vatican Council completes and fixes for ever the external authority of the Church,' so that now the attention of the Church and her children can 'be turned more directly to the divine and interior authority of the Holy Ghost in the soul' (p. 365). Whether there are any hopes of his expectation being fulfilled we will not now discuss. We venture to urge that it was unbecoming and childish in a person whose theological learning and capacity were so limited to cast scorn on 'the stupid Döllingerites' and their 'insane opposition to the definition of the Vatican' (p. 366).

From Rome Hecker returned, in June 1870, to America and his former work; but a sad change was at hand. He was but fifty-one years of age, but his strength had long been failing. Dyspepsia, headache, insomnia, claimed him as their victim; and together with them came a strange alteration of character. The vigorous, confident, sanguine man became depressed and unfit for the lightest work. He could not say

Mass without breaking into uncontrolled sobs ; even the reception of Holy Communion laid such a strain upon him that it rendered him unable to attend to necessary duties ; and at one time he was obliged to abstain from it for months (p. 413). His religion had been of a remarkably cheerful type : it seemed ' to have no penitential side ' (p. 374) ; but now he became the prey of the deepest sadness and fear of the Judgment of God. At the same time that he was unable to undertake the least work he was harassed by the most intense desire for labour, and by haunting schemes of projects which he was unable to attempt. Into this spiritual discipline we dare not enter ; the Word of desolation from the Cross hallows such trials beyond the boldness of speech. It is a comfort and an encouragement to learn that though God slew him, yet did he put his trust in Him. The physical nature of his malady is not stated in the biography, except that we are told that there was not the softening of the brain which was at one time apprehended, and that for the last few years he was subject to *angina pectoris*. We owe to the kindness of a physician the conjecture that he was probably afflicted with ossification of the brain, together with peripheral neuritis. That his illness was in part due to the excessive austerity of his earlier life is admitted by Hecker himself, and by his biographer (p. 372). A great part of the seventeen years of this penance he spent, with little relief, at various health-resorts in Europe ; and in 1873-4 he took a journey, with somewhat better results, to Egypt and the Holy Land. On his return, a visit to Rome in its new condition was rather depressing to him ; but he was cheered by the elevation to the Cardinalate of his old friend, Archbishop McClosky, the first American to receive that honour. He took it to be a token that ' every nation will be represented in the College of Cardinals in proportion to its importance, and in this way the Holy See will represent by its advisers the entire world ' (p. 390) : a sanguine hope, which receives a strange comment in the latest appointment of Cardinals, which secures to Italy a majority of thirteen in the election of the next Pope. He certainly did not abandon his conviction that the Latin type of character, nourished by the Roman Church in her struggle with Protestantism, is not adapted, in its inculcation of the passive virtues and its distrust of individual inspiration, to win back the modern world. A tract to this effect, though approved by the Roman censors of the press, was at the last moment withheld from publication by the authorities, who held it to be inexpedient. We read with some surprise that,

in spi
to be
Fren
of the
here
autho

W
hims
thoug
form
house
ness,
he re
of his
years
broke
comm
work
relea
the l
Dece

V
vener
his p
willin
capac
he re
towa
whom
previ
regar
think
estim
give
taken
We c
ment
able
inde
the
attitu
it is

V
trove

in spite of this decision, a man so loyal as Hecker allowed it to be published anonymously in London, and translated into French. He seems to ascribe the writing of it to the guidance of the Holy Ghost (p. 396). Very probably; but is there not here some indication of the probability of a strain between authority and the conscience?

When cure was manifestly impossible, the sick man allowed himself to be brought back to the country which he loved, though the mere thought of resuming any portion of his former work was intolerable. For a time he dwelt in the house of his brother George, now a prosperous man of business, who himself had joined the Roman Church. Thence he removed, in expectation of immediate death, to the house of his community. But he was yet to linger for nine years—years of undiminished physical distress, and of almost unbroken spiritual misery; though we are fain to hope that communion with his brethren and a small amount of literary work were not without some degree of solace. At last the release was at hand. On September 15, 1887, he received the last Sacraments; but he revived, and it was not until December 22, 1888, that he entered into rest.

We trust that we have been able to manifest the sincere veneration with which we regard Father Hecker. We love his patriotism, and we love still more his conviction of the willingness of God to address the spirit of man, and of the capacity of man's spirit to receive the Word of God; in which he reminds us of that rarest of saints, Catherine of Genoa, towards whom he nourished a very tender devotion, and of whom we have endeavoured to give some account in a previous number of this *Review*.¹ But we cannot honestly regard him as a great thinker or a man of learning; and we think that Father Elliott is misled by a natural but excessive estimate of his friend. In other respects we are not able to give very high praise to this work. Notice has already been taken of the lack of information on some interesting points. We complain also of a ponderous style, of clumsy arrangement, of the want of chronological data, and (an unpardonable fault in the eyes of a reviewer) of the absence of an index. On the other hand, we are glad to give the writer the praise of perfect candour; and, though we think his attitude towards the members of other communions narrow, it is never uncharitable.

We cannot end without giving a short survey of the controversy about 'Americanism,' which has arisen in connexion

¹ *Church Quarterly Review*, July, 1897.

with Father Hecker. On this topic we get no help from Father Elliott; for his book was published some years before the controversy broke out. But we find the information we desire in another, and a much shorter, *Life of Hecker*, by Mr. Sedgwick, which, except on this point, contains nothing that is not given by Father Elliott, but puts its information in a much more vivid and interesting way.¹

We learn from Mr. Sedgwick that the ideas of Nationalism expressed in Father Elliott's work at first excited little notice in America, where a similar line was taken by many eminent ecclesiastics, some of whom took a part in the Chicago 'Parliament of Religions,' in 1893, with which the Anglican bishops, led by Archbishop Benson, with more dignity and reverence, refused to be concerned.² There will always be, in every part of the Church, two tendencies of thought—the one to a cautious conservatism, the other towards innovation or reform; and the *Life of Father Hecker* proved to be the spark which kindled these two schools into controversy. The *Life* was, not very exactly, translated into French, in 1897, and the following year it was assailed with considerable asperity by the Abbé Maignen, of the Congregation of Saint Vincent de Paul, in a book entitled *Le Père Hecker, est-il un Saint?* Cardinal Richard refused his sanction to the publication of this work in Paris; whereupon M. Maignen applied for an *imprimatur* to Father Lepidi, the Dominican Master of the Sacred Palace in Rome.

The Pope, who had some years before commended the Paulists' method of holding conferences with aliens, now intervened in the controversy with a letter addressed to Cardinal Gibbons, who was regarded as one of those who sympathised with 'Americanism.' He begins with an allusion to Hecker's *Life* as having given rise to the expression of certain 'new opinions,' though he refrains from saying that those opinions are expressed in the *Life*, or were held by Hecker. The opinions which are censured are these: That the Church ought to accommodate her doctrines to the circumstances of modern life; that certain doctrines may without blame be ignored; that the Church ought so to relax her supervision as to allow the faithful 'each one to follow out more freely the leading of his own mind'; that the proclamation of Papal Infallibility renders it safe to concede to the faithful a 'wider and freer field both for thought and action.' Of these opinions it is doubtful whether any but the last can be justly

¹ *Father Hecker*, by Henry D. Sedgwick, Jun.; Boston, 1900.

² *Life of Archbishop Benson*, ii. 682.

attrib
who n
deed,
fectio
other
suffic
as to
sured
Pope
to th
out t
their
are c
its v
does
cover
hims
bette

the l
wou
were
Pop
he g
stat
any
the
of C

Wil
Tev
and
tas
pre
obe
wh
to
pro
lea
per
in
ex
wh
in
for

help from years before information we Hecker, by means nothing information nationalism little notice y eminent e Chicago Anglican gnity and ways be, in ight—the innovation to be the rsy. The e, in 1897, considerable of Saint e, *est-il un* e publica- n applied n Master ended the ens, now essed to ose who allusion ession of ing that held by e: That e circum- without er super- out more nation of faithful a Of these e justly 900.

attributed to Hecker. The Pope continues to censure those who regard 'external guidance' as being 'superfluous, and, indeed, not useful in any sense' for those who are aiming at perfection; but although Hecker, like S. Catherine of Genoa, and other saints, found the internal guidance of the Holy Spirit sufficient direction for himself, he laid down no general rule as to the need of direction. Further, the teaching is censured which exalts the natural virtues over those which the Pope calls evangelical; but certainly Hecker is not subject to the blame of depreciating faith and love when he points out that honesty, truthfulness, and manliness have not received their due prominence in modern Romanism. Finally, those are censured who show contempt for the Religious Life and its vows as unsuited to this age. But here, again, Hecker does not fall under the censure, unless it is to be stretched to cover S. Philip Neri, S. Vincent de Paul, and Manning himself, who thought that a laxer form of Community was better fitted to these times than the older and stricter Rules.

The leaders of the 'American' school loyally accepted the Pope's teaching; and, indeed, except on one point, Hecker would not have recognized his own views among those which were censured. On the other hand, it seems clear that the Pope's authority is cast on the side of conservatism, and that he gives no countenance to any feeling of discontent with the state of the Roman system as it is, and no encouragement to anyone who would desire to bring it more into accord with the needs, the convictions, and the aspirations of free nations of German blood.

Are Hecker's generous hopes, then, to come to nought? Will the Roman Church never succeed in reabsorbing the Teutonic spirit, with its manly independence and love of truth and of liberty? Or will she be enabled to fulfil the difficult task of reconciling authority and freedom? We do not presume to decide. To Hecker, who regarded the Roman obedience as co-extensive with the Catholic Church, and to whom schism was separation *from* the Church, it was natural to expect the Roman Church to be the heir of all God's promises. To us, who regard schism as, in some cases at least, division *in* the Church, there can be no assurance of perfection until every portion of divided Christendom unites in bringing its tribute and receiving its blessing. We do not expect any one portion of the Church to attain to a perfection which is the heritage of the whole. Whether history points in Hecker's direction or in ours we cannot now discuss; but for ourselves we are unable to see any signs of a wider spirit

stirring in the Roman Communion since the Vatican Council. We have seen that the liberty which Hecker claimed was not large, and yet even that liberty he could obtain only at the cost of disregarding the direction of authority; and we have seen that the Pope has repudiated all thought of concession to the claims of individual liberty. We should, indeed, be thankful if we could entertain the hope that the Roman Church, to which is entrusted by God the care of so many millions of Christian souls, would move in the direction of greater liberty; but, while we confess the guidance of the Holy Spirit as given to every portion of the Church as to every Christian, we can no more expect the perfection of any portion of divided Christendom than that of any individual. We leave the matter in the hands of Infinite Love; and the hope that He may have great things in store for the Roman Church is in some degree justified by the fact that He raises up in her such saints as Father Hecker.

ART. III.—LIVERPOOL CATHEDRAL SCHEME.

1. *Article 'Cathedral,' Encyclopædia Britannica.* (London, 1876.)
2. *Address delivered at the Liverpool Diocesan Conference.* By the Right Rev. FRANCIS JAMES CHAVASSE, D.D., Lord Bishop of Liverpool. (Liverpool, 1900.)
3. *Liverpool Cathedral: a Letter to the Lord Bishop of Liverpool.* By G. H. RENDALL,¹ Principal of University College, and W. M. CONWAY, Roscoe Professor of Art at University College. (Liverpool, 1886.)
4. *St. Nicholas at the Port: being a Lecture on the place of a Cathedral in City Life.* By CHARLES WILLIAM STUBBS,² M.A., Rector of Wavertree. (Liverpool, 1892.)
5. *History of Modern Architecture.* By JAMES FERGUSON, D.C.L., F.R.S., &c. (London, 1891.)
6. *Modern Architecture: a book for Architects and the Public.* By H. H. STATHAM. (London, 1897.)

THE Diocese of Liverpool is to be congratulated upon the possession of a splendid opportunity. The proposal to build a Cathedral in the midst of this great centre of commerce and population is indeed no new one; it is one with which

¹ Now Head Master of Charterhouse.

² Now Dean of Ely.

the Diocese and city have for many years been familiar. But the scheme has recently been brought again within the region of possibility. A committee has been formed, a site chosen, and a quarter of the probable cost subscribed. The project is naturally one of great interest locally, but the interest of it is also far more than merely local. We believe, indeed, that the Church at large will watch the fate of this proposal with no small measure of attention, and that if the Diocese shows itself resolved to carry the scheme through to an issue that is commensurate with its possibilities, the Bishop and his supporters will receive sympathy and encouragement from all quarters of the Anglican Communion. It is in this belief that we invite the attention of our readers to the proposal at its present stage of development, and also to one or two of the problems which must, in the nature of things, present themselves for settlement ere its completion can be attained. We purpose in the present article to give some account of the history of the project so far as it has gone, and then to offer some considerations on questions of more general interest, such as the style of architecture to be employed, and the possibilities of a modern Cathedral as the spiritual centre of the Church's activities in the Diocese as a whole.

At the middle of the last century there were few people of average judgment who would not have regarded a modern Cathedral in this country as almost a contradiction in terms. The somewhat drastic, but not altogether unnecessary, legislation of 1840, together with the Reports of the Commissioners issued in 1854-5, forms a striking evidence of the extent to which the Cathedrals of this country had become divorced from the main interests of the Church's life. In the common conception they stood for the most part as glorious relics of the past. Removed, as a rule, from the great centres of growing population, enriched by the thousand associations of their long history, by their opportunities of learned leisure, and by the peculiar beauties of their architecture, they still presented, even to those who loved them best, the problem of ancient institutions not always easy to defend on the ground of immediate and obvious utility. The Chapter of Durham, for example, in their reply to the Commissioners expressed the opinion that it was 'of essential moment that the Cathedrals should be brought into closer connexion and more intimate co-operation with the parochial system of their several Dioceses;' while the immense difficulties of effecting this or any similar readjustment may be readily realized by anyone

who reads in his biography the account of the problems which confronted Dean Church on his appointment to the Deanery of St. Paul's. In short, it was only the common view which was expressed by Emerson in his essay on 'Religion' in England, when he described the Cathedrals as 'works to which the key is lost, with the sentiment which created them.' And from an entirely different standpoint the same opinion was re-echoed when the late Bishop of Carlisle wrote in 1872 that 'we might as well expect another *Iliad* from a Greek poet as another Cathedral from an English architect.' Indeed the problem was how to defend and use the old rather than how to devise and project the new. What fresh needs, fresh possibilities for Cathedral life and activity might arise in the future was a question with which only a few enthusiastic Churchmen felt they had any manner of concern.

Thus when the Church Congress of 1869 was held in Liverpool and discussed as one of the topics upon its programme 'The Capabilities of our Cathedrals,' there is little reason to feel surprise that the various speakers dwelt rather upon what the Cathedral ought to be and might be than upon its actual present value as a centre of diocesan activity. Dean Howson in the opening paper frankly acknowledged the need for Cathedral reform; while with even more surprising frankness a subsequent speaker admitted that his experience of a residentiary canonry had led him to believe that canons in residence had no spiritual duties at all. It will be allowed that this was hardly the environment and the season in which the scheme for a new Cathedral might be calculated to take root and thrive. The obvious criticism lay so readily to hand, 'Let the Church turn to fuller account the splendid foundations already in her possession before she diverts her energies to the task of adding new Cathedrals to the old.' Nevertheless the suggestion of a Cathedral for Liverpool was made at this meeting of the Congress, and made with no apology for its venture, but rather with an enthusiastic conviction of the possibilities of its success. Mr. Beresford Hope, who through good report and ill had kept firm his faith in the Cathedral as an essential factor in the modern life of the Church, who had rendered the cause yeoman service by the publication of his book, *The Cathedral of the Nineteenth Century*, and who deserves now to be ranked with Archbishop Benson as champion of the ancient foundations in days when criticism of them was at once easy, necessary, and abundant, drew a picture which Liverpool

Church
might
The
separ
Church
than
on th
broug
locali
ripe,
T
Ryle
deter
Church
was a
befor
thick
withi
180
ficien
whol
into
St. I
fine
conv
be r
edifi
left
diss
and
trav
exam
blan
quar
than
for
mai
bee
grat
may
But
in
Chu
stru
As

Churchmen might still find inspiring, of all that a Cathedral might accomplish if once erected in the midst of their city. The plan of dividing the Diocese of Chester, of creating a separate See of Liverpool, and of replacing the old Parish Church by a less inadequate structure, had already on more than one occasion been proposed and considerable discussion on the subject had taken place. The Congress of 1869 brought the scheme once more before the attention of the locality and of the Church as a whole; the time was not yet ripe, but still the project had made definite advance.

The Bishopric of Liverpool was created in 1880. Dr. Ryle was consecrated Bishop, and an Order in Council determined St. Peter's Parish Church to be the Cathedral Church of the Diocese. The new Bishop, who, though vigorous, was an old man for so exacting a position, had no easy task before him. The Diocese, compact, it is true, in area, was thickly populated, some million and a quarter souls being within its borders. To minister to their wants there were 180 incumbents; the supply of assistant clergy was insufficient, the value of the livings in many cases very small, the whole diocesan organization had to be created and brought into working order; and, to crown all, the Parish Church of St. Peter was utterly unworthy of its new dignity. Even a fine church does not always prove a good Cathedral. The conversion in the cases of Newcastle and Manchester cannot be regarded wholly with satisfaction. But in Liverpool the edifice was a poor one of its type, and even as a parish church left much to be desired. As a Cathedral it was a cause of dissatisfaction to the Churchman for the sake of his Church, and to the citizen for the sake of his city; while the American traveller landing in the Mersey and viewing it as his first example of the English Cathedral could only regard it with blank incredulity and dismay. So obvious was its inadequacy that there is no reason to feel surprise that no more than the sum of 576*l.* was spent upon the alterations necessary for its use as a Cathedral church. For many years it has maintained a reverent standard of daily worship which has been of no small value to the Diocese, and for which all gratitude and honour are due to the present Rector. To that may be added the fact that it stands in a central position. But when this has been said there is little more to be urged in its favour, and it would have been small credit to the Churchmen of the Diocese had they not felt impatient for a structure more worthy of the worship and service of God. As a natural outcome of this the Diocesan Conference of

1881 discussed at length the question, 'Ought the Diocese of Liverpool to have a Cathedral?' It was urged very truly that the Church does gain in strength by asserting itself in architecture, and that in a building and foundation worthy of their high purpose a remedy might be found for the isolation, congregationalism, and want of unity and solidarity which were in some cases characteristic of the parochial system on its weaker side. It is true that even here, at the very outset of the scheme in its first practical phase, the dissentient voice was heard; it was urged by one speaker with no little force that the proposal should be deferred until provision was made for a greater number of clergy in the Diocese. But on the whole the feeling was strong on the other side, and the Conference resolved by an overwhelming majority that the new Cathedral ought to be. And thus a committee was formed consisting of some 200 members, and so constituted that it was thoroughly representative of the clergy and laity of the Diocese. Sub-committees were appointed—one to deal with the question of the site, another to manage the finances, and a third to consider the question of architecture. By the early part of 1883 the proposal was beginning to take definite shape; it was much discussed, much criticized, and thoroughly 'in the air.' Perhaps the possibilities presented themselves more clearly than the difficulties and problems which they involved for their realization, but at any rate the scheme had been definitely proposed, definitely taken in hand, and the world looked on with some considerable interest to see what the result would be.

We do not believe it would interest our readers for us to describe in detail the various stages by which the scheme as an immediate practical proposal came to be laid aside. Whoever has the desire to do so may, to some extent, follow out its history in the files of the various local newspapers, where he will read correspondence sometimes acrimonious and sometimes not wholly creditable to the writers. It is a chapter of diocesan history which is still mentioned both in clerical and lay circles with some little bitterness and feeling. But inasmuch as the failure of the proposal has been frequently made the subject of strong criticism, and, as we believe, the common opinion about it still is that there was failure where there should have been success, we think it may be worth while to call our readers' attention to one or two of the difficulties and problems which were involved. Some of them are of such a nature that they will probably, under similar conditions, have to be faced again in other quarters,

and th
ever i
the ho
The
of the
Dioc
Dioc
and w
blem
Now
ment
strong
behin
God.
its wa
is goo
all we
Conw
civic
Liver
Engla
ment
for th
midst
Egyp
they
resolu
beaut
Rome
pense
noble
motiv
that i
welco
this, i
the r
churc
Had
to an
touch
but i
charg
life th
as mo

and their mention may thus serve for future guidance whenever in other large modern cities men set their hands to build the house of God.

The proposal raised at once the question of the relation of the civic aspirations of Liverpool to the other needs of the Diocese as a whole. The city was in want of a Cathedral: the Diocese needed also churches, funds, and men. Given a great and wealthy town as the centre of a new Diocese, and the problem of these conflicting interests will almost inevitably recur. Now we will at once acknowledge and welcome the sentiment which makes the Churchmen of any important city feel strongly that their own particular community shall not fall behind others in the scale of its provision for the service of God. That sentiment is partly civic, partly religious, but in its way it is a blending of Christianity and citizenship which is good alike for the municipality and the Church. Allowing all weight to the contention of Dr. Rendall and Professor Conway that civic greatness must find expression in truly civic forms, and that the religious life of the community of Liverpool as a whole was wider than that of the Church of England within it,¹ there is still much to admire in the sentiment which makes citizens of no mean city resolve that it is for the credit of their citizenship that God's worship in their midst shall also not be mean. Since the ancient kings of Egypt vied with one another in the vastness of the structures they erected, or since the Republic of Florence declared its resolution to build a Cathedral that should surpass in its beauty the greatest architectural productions of Greece and Rome, human nature has never been altogether able to dispense with competitive ambition as a motive for even its noblest achievements. It is obvious that there are other motives and higher. Our concern at present is only to observe that if a great city desires a great church it is an aspiration to welcome and commend. But as against this, conflicting with this, in some sense the alternative of this, were the needs of the rapidly-growing population, the want of more parish churches, the inadequacy of clerical incomes, the lack of men. Had Bishop Ryle succeeded in guiding the Cathedral scheme to an issue and left these other necessities of his Diocese untouched, his episcopate might have left its evident monument; but it would have been open to serious criticism and the charge of many things left undone. In the latter years of his life the late Bishop always said that he regarded other needs as more pressing, and this conflict of different wants was pro-

¹ *Liverpool Cathedral*, p. 4.

bably present to his mind from the beginning of his tenure of the See. St. Jerome had felt the same problem when he contrasted the building of elaborate churches with the claims of charity. It had struck Bishop Blomfield in the 'thirties' as he passed from the wealth of St. Paul's to the destitution and wants of the vast population growing up not two miles away. And when the Cathedral proposal came first before the Diocese of Liverpool the consciousness of the many other duties to which the Church was bound to set her hand inevitably had its weight. This, among other causes, told against the scheme, and it is a question which will always need the judgment of the Church's wisest administrators to determine what proportion of her energies, her resources and her attention she can afford to divert to the building of a great and noble House of Prayer. There are conditions under which her spiritual gain by the undertaking of such a task may be great indeed. There are other conditions under which it is her wisdom to realize that the time to build the House of the Lord is not yet come.

To this difficulty must be added the problem of selecting the best out of twenty-three possible sites. The 'Battle of the Sites' is still well remembered locally, and when that was solved the question at once arose of the most appropriate style of architecture for a Cathedral that was to stand in an environment of classical buildings. It would be of little interest to treat at length of these controversies. Not unnaturally the time involved in their discussion caused the public enthusiasm to cool down. Not unnaturally, the sympathies and interest of those who felt strongly the defects of the site chosen were alienated by the choice. An Act of Parliament was obtained in 1885, which authorised the commencement of operations, but time went by and no start was made, till at last the period allowed by the Act elapsed without any actual work being done. A sum of 10,000*l.* was offered in 1887 by the late Sir Andrew Walker, but the offer was not followed up by other promises, and finally it only remained for the Cathedral committee to report in the following year that the scheme was at a complete standstill. When Bishop Ryle addressed his Diocesan Conference a little later he spoke of the proposal as 'sleeping' and 'on the shelf.' And with an outspoken frankness which was one of the late Bishop's characteristics, he added, 'I admit that the position of the scheme is rather humbling after such a large expenditure of time, talk, controversy, and not a little money, on the subject. I am not surprised that Churchmen at a distance, who

do not understand Liverpool, speak rather scornfully of us.'

To a very large number of people the failure of the proposal at this stage was a matter of acute disappointment and chagrin. The work wanted doing; the Church had set her hand to do it, and the Church had not succeeded. Practical men who have been accustomed in their own personal experience to carry through the enterprises they have undertaken regard such failures with a natural impatience; and if their own names have been associated with the project its miscarriage becomes to them a matter also for personal dissatisfaction. Nevertheless, it may be said without hesitation that on the whole the Church has gained, and the scheme has gained, by the delay. The Diocese is in a far better position for the accomplishment of the task to-day than it was in 1880. The episcopate of the late Bishop was a time of growth, and growth of all kinds is to be measured afterwards, by results. During the last twenty years the number of parochial clergy in the Diocese of Liverpool has risen from 255 to 431. Forty-four new churches have been consecrated. Many churches have been restored, and many smaller buildings for parochial purposes erected. There is a clergy sustentation fund of 25,000*l.*, and the more important section of a Diocesan Church House has already been built and brought into use. The tone of Church life has distinctly improved; and, while there are men who take strongly partisan views in either direction, there is, on the whole, unquestionably a far greater measure of unanimity among the clergy of the Diocese. It cannot with any fair reason be now contended that the opportunity has not yet come. No one to-day can point to projects that have a reasonable claim to prior accomplishment. The time indeed is ripe; and so far the scheme in its revived form has made good progress. Warned by previous experience, the Bishop and his committee wisely made no proposal to the public until they had a site in view which they could unanimously recommend. The position chosen is that of St. James's Mount, and at a public meeting held in the Town Hall on June 17th last this was adopted as the site for the Liverpool Cathedral by an overwhelming majority. To this, as to all the other possible positions, there are objections, and it is well to recognize them. The site involves a departure from the usual custom of orientation. It is not so central by some little distance as other positions, and one, at least, among the latter does offer a splendid vista for a fine west front. Moreover, St. James's Mount is an open space,

and growing modern cities do well to be jealous of their surrender. But it is accessible; it is an eminence; it is free from noise; its cost will perhaps be 30,000*l.* as against 200,000*l.*, while, if the existing Cathedral church—which would be no longer wanted—were surrendered, and the site of it turned into an open space, there is no question that the net result would be a gain to the town. We have little doubt that this position has been wisely adopted, taking all the arguments into consideration, and we are glad to believe that there is no likelihood of any recrudescence of the old controversy. The plan has started well, and at least one difficulty has been fairly faced and overcome.

Such, up to the present time, is the history of the Liverpool Cathedral scheme, and we believe our readers will watch its development with greater interest from knowing something of its past vicissitudes. The question which now lies immediately before the Bishop and his committee is that of architecture. Many considerations suggest themselves in this connexion. The uses for which the building is to be employed, the *genius loci*, the spirit of the age, and the claims of the various schools of architecture will all demand the most careful attention; nor, as we think, is it wholly an easy matter to decide upon the type of structure most appropriate under the given conditions. In one respect, moreover, those who are in charge of the proposal have a free hand. The site chosen involves the proximity of no large buildings of any very distinctive character. So far, then, that type of architecture which is on its own merits most desirable may be selected without (as in the case of the former site) any very great risks being involved by the nature of the environment. We believe it probable that the competition will again be thrown open, though it is not likely that the committee will fail to bear in mind the merits of the designs submitted in 1885. At the present stage no detailed discussion of this point is possible, but there are one or two suggestions of general architectural interest that have been made in connexion with the scheme, and to which we think our readers will be glad to give some measure of consideration.

We have little doubt that on the whole there will be a certain natural balance of feeling among Church people in favour of the employment of some form of Gothic architecture. The names of the architects selected in the previous competition may be taken as evidence that this was the type of structure which was then regarded as most suitable and natural. It is, of course, the National style. In his book on

their sur-
it is free
s against
h—which
the site
that the
tle doubt
g all the
lieve that
old con-
difficulty

ne Liver-
will watch
g some-
now lies
s that of
es in this
s to be
e claims
hand the
an easy
appropriate
er, those
The site
s of any
of archi-
may be
any very
ronment.
again be
ittee will
mitted in
of this
tions of
in con-
readers

will be a
people in
architec-
previous
the type
ble and
book on

The Cathedral of the Nineteenth Century Mr. Beresford Hope adheres to it without hesitation, while the one precedent of a modern English Cathedral, Mr. Pearson's beautiful work at Truro, forms, so far as it has been carried out, an evidence and omen of possible success. Coleridge defined the principle of Gothic architecture as 'Infinity made imaginable.' It is, *par excellence*, the form in which Christianity has expressed and embodied its faith, its aspiration after dimly realized possibilities, its gift of rest from the world's daily turmoil, and its consciousness of the much that binds man to another world that he does not see. And with all their varieties and points of contrast the Cathedral churches of England have, taken as a class, their distinctive characteristics, which in some measure they have preserved throughout the various developments of Gothic architecture by which they have been affected. The long chancel, the comparatively low roof, the east end square and not apsidal, are among their common features. Thus the typical English Cathedral does exist, as all men recognize, and the permanence of the type may be even exemplified by the Gothic plan upon which St. Paul's, the one exception in point of architecture, eventually was built. The Church, like the nation, has her history behind her; and her history is a heritage of which the Cathedrals are an abiding monument. All that tradition means to a race innately conservative, all the sacred associations that have gathered in centuries of worship round the familiar points of plan and structure, all the intrinsic beauties which it may claim rightfully as its own, are thus so many strong arguments in favour of adherence to the Gothic style. We do not doubt that they will receive their full consideration when the Bishop and his committee come to make their decision. And if there be any departure from the traditional type, it will undoubtedly be their wisdom to make sure that the reasons for their choice are sufficient and are conclusive.

All these arguments will have full weight. Let us look for a moment at what may be said on the other side. In the first place, then, it appears incontestably true, as Dr. Rendall and Professor Conway remark in their *Letter*, that the form of the Gothic Cathedral was developed and defined by the needs of the people for whom it was raised.¹ In other words, at the very basis of the mediæval Cathedral lies the principle of recognizing present wants and present possibilities. To ignore present wants now, in order to reproduce a past form, however beautiful, is therefore to violate a fundamental canon

¹ *Liverpool Cathedral*, p. 7.

of the generations to which we owe Salisbury and York. We do not hold it probable that the majority of Church people would be by any means in entire agreement with Mr. Statham's chapter on Church architecture.¹ He has little antiquarian and little ecclesiastical interest, and his point of view is radically unlike that of Pugin or of Street. But in his criticisms of the long chancel, of the screen, and of the contracted space at the junction of the transepts and the nave, he speaks only of what all unbiassed observers must acknowledge. When the present Bishop of Liverpool was consecrated in York Minster the choir was unused, and a temporary sanctuary had to be arranged in the nave outside the screen. When a service of mourning was held in Westminster Abbey for General Gordon's death the *Pall Mall* reported that the 'greater number of those present could not join in the services.' Yet surely it is at least one among the functions of a Cathedral in a great city that through it the Church shall have the opportunity of appealing both by word and symbol and by the evidence of her most solemn service to the gathered numbers in her Master's name. In other words, the essentials of such a structure are that the open space at the 'crossing' shall be ample, and offer the maximum of accommodation within the range of the pulpit, and also that the Altar-table shall be so situated that it is visible from as many points as possible, a condition surely of sufficient importance to justify, if need be, the use of the side chapel for the Daily Offices, and the rigorous exclusion of mere sightseers during the hours of service. The Cathedral should be available for God's worship as one splendid whole. Like the ideal Church, it should be truly one, the central purpose and conception never being lost in the diversity of the parts. In this connexion it will be appropriate for us to make some mention of the design sent in during 1885 by Mr. Emerson, the president this year of the Royal Institute of British Architects. A sketch of this design may be seen in Mr. Statham's book,² and the detailed Report may be seen by visitors in Liverpool at the Picton Reading Room. Adhering to Gothic architecture, although he departs from the strictly mediæval type of Cathedral, Mr. Emerson secures the two points above mentioned with, as we think, very considerable success. On his plan 1,400 persons could be seated within 100 feet of the pulpit, while the chancel, being of moderate length, renders the Altar-table visible from a considerably wider area than is

¹ *Modern Architecture*, pp. 40-95.

² *Ibid.* p. 65.

usual. Whatever style of architecture be eventually adopted, we believe those two conditions, which are thus secured by Mr. Emerson's design, ought to be treated as essentials. And it has to be acknowledged that they involve to some extent a modification of the typical mediæval plan.

Still more striking, however, is the departure from English precedent to be found in Mr. Emerson's dome. Architecturally, of course, the combination of a dome with a Gothic structure is fully justified by the example of the baptisteries at Florence and Pisa, and of S. Maria del Fiore in the former city. To what extent the surroundings of the site originally selected may have influenced Mr. Emerson in this proposal we cannot say. The main reasons in favour of it, however, as given in his Report, appear equally applicable to the conditions of the present site, or at least sufficiently so to render some notice of them desirable. We are told in the *Parentalia* that Sir Christopher Wren suggested the dome of St. Paul's because he believed that, in such a position as the Cathedral was to occupy, it would possess 'incomparable more grace than it is possible for the lean shaft of a steeple to afford.' So, in effect, says Mr. Emerson. 'In large cities,' he writes, 'like London, Paris and Liverpool, structures of this style [*i.e.* the strictly mediæval style with towers or spires] cannot hold their own, they want mass;' and Mr. Emerson goes on to cite the new Cathedral in Edinburgh as an example of a building which for this reason fails to be externally impressive. On the other hand, he adduces the telling examples of St. Paul's in London, St. Peter's in Rome, S. Maria del Fiore in Florence, and also the Panthéon in Paris to prove that a church with a grand domical central feature does rise with commanding effect even in a city of very wide area. For a form of structure thus externally striking there is also to be claimed the advantage of internal grandeur and the practical consideration that constructionally it is singularly well adapted for the roofing of a large open space at the 'crossing,' such as a modern Cathedral requires. Mr. Emerson's design as a whole did not, of course, pass without criticism when originally suggested. It was said to be externally classic and internally Gothic in its general result, and was accused of a 'want of homogeneous effect when considered in detail.' It was also open to the charge with which all new proposals are greeted by the lovers of the past—that it was an 'experiment,' and that the old was better. It is not our concern to defend its details, which would probably have received considerable modification had

it been carried into execution; while the fact that it was proposed for a particular site, and for an environment of other structures very definitely characterised, naturally robs it of some of its interest, now that this particular site is no longer in question. We are sure, however, that the letterpress of Mr. Emerson's Report is well worth consideration, in so far as it deals with general principles, while three of the main features of his proposal—the wide central space, the shortened chancel and the dome—have very real advantages as elements in a Cathedral to be erected under modern conditions in a great centre of population. We have noticed this design at considerable length because we believe that in all probability Gothic will be selected as the style—in fact, that the Building Committee has reported in its favour. We feel, therefore, that it is especially incumbent upon us to emphasize the necessity of avoiding anything like mere antiquarianism, and of adapting the new building to the needs and life of a great commercial city of the present day.

One other proposal was put forward with regard to the scheme in its earlier stages, which is of sufficient intrinsic interest to be noticed again. The suggestion was made, we believe, by the late Canon Venables, and certainly from other quarters, that the Diocese of Liverpool should erect its Cathedral on the lines of the design originally suggested by Sir Christopher Wren for the rebuilding of St. Paul's. This design is very fully described in Mr. Fergusson's book,¹ and our readers may remember that its main features were the plan of the form of a Greek Cross, with a central dome of about the same diameter as the present one. There was to have been a detached frontispiece, jointed to the main body of the building by a narrow vestibule or waist, and the whole character of the architecture would have been, of course, classical. The design was submitted in 1673, but owing to the opposition of the Duke of York, and also to its unpopularity with the clergy, it was not adopted, and the estimates formed of its merits appear to have been always various. Wren himself is said to have shed tears at its rejection, and to have declared in private conversation that he set a higher value upon it than upon any other he had made before or since. The design won the admiration of Dean Milman, though he never regretted the prolongation of the nave, while it had the interest of certain points of similarity with some of the famous churches of the Byzantine type. Competent judges have regarded St. Sophia as

¹ *History of Modern Architecture*, ii. 31 sqq.

posse
othe
of W
hand,
Wren
St. P
to tha
with
gives
Shoul
plated
— no
tophe
consi
passa
and s

' A
dome
that t
the w
indica
than t
increa
dome,
and l
the ev
dome
the do
presen

T
and v
large
it has
day
adjus
divisi
the I
and
point
loyall
has b

T
our p

possessing a more beautifully proportioned interior than any other church yet erected, and the strong point of this design of Wren's was probably also the interior. On the other hand, there has been much adverse criticism of it, and as Wren made a model of his design, which still exists in St. Paul's Cathedral, it is criticism that has more to appeal to than mere proposals on paper. The defects of it are dealt with in some detail in Mr. Fergusson's book,¹ in which he gives also suggestions as to how they may be rectified. Should a purely classical style of architecture be contemplated for the Liverpool Cathedral, this proposal of reviving — no doubt with modifications — a design of which Sir Christopher had himself so high an opinion might be well worth consideration, and in this belief we shall quote at length the passage in which Mr. Fergusson has summed up his criticism and suggestions:

'Assuming, however,' he writes, 'that the external form of the dome would have been modified till it resembled the present one, that the western campaniles would have been introduced, and that the whole design would have been revised in the sense above indicated, the result certainly would have been far more satisfactory than the present design [*sc.* of St. Paul's]. Internally, the gradually increasing magnificence from the principal entrance to the great dome, with nothing beyond but a small choir of the same design and length as the transepts, would have been in perfect taste, while the ever varying perspectives in the great circumambient aisle of the dome would have surpassed those in the great aisle that surrounds the dome at St. Peter's, while, externally, nearly all the faults of the present design would have been avoided.'²

The problem of the choice of style is not an easy one, and we leave our readers to find their own solutions. To a large extent the question is one of taste and sympathies, but it has at least this measure of kinship to many of the present-day problems of Christian theology, that it involves some adjustment of the old and the new. Bearing in mind former divisions of opinion in connexion with this scheme, we trust the Diocese of Liverpool will be wisely guided to a definite and happy decision, and that if there be a minority disappointed at the type of edifice selected, they will not the less loyally co-operate for its completion when once the last word has been said on either side.

There remains for discussion the most important topic of our present paper, the purposes, namely, of a Cathedral, and

¹ *History of Modern Architecture*, ii. 33 sqq.

² *Ibid.* ii. 35.

its capabilities of diocesan usefulness. For a Cathedral in its essential nature is, as has been remarked, 'both a building and an institution.' We take this opportunity of expressing our strong conviction of the necessity of keeping the latter fact and its consequences in view. For it involves, of course, this: that there must be adequate provision made, before the scheme can be considered complete, for a sufficient endowment to enable the various functions of such an institution to be carried on. Very rightly does the Bishop say in his diocesan address¹ that the building must be worthy of Liverpool and of the Church of England. From the very liberal amount—150,000*l.*—already contributed we have little doubt that the Diocese intends that the scale and dignity of its Cathedral shall be adequate and worthy. But it is a common experience in the present day to find funds given readily for the building of a church, but given in an altogether insufficient measure when the object is the less evident one of an endowment. We trust the Diocese will therefore realize at the outset that the maintenance of the fabric and of the various services—the provision of adequate stipends for the canons and other clergy—the security that when the structure is completed there shall not be a struggle for the means whereby to fulfil its highest purposes, are objects which will demand a very considerable financial effort, quite apart from the funds needed for the original erection. We are indebted to one who speaks with experience for the excellent suggestion that a sum of 10 per cent. should be set aside from the very first for an endowment fund, and in any case the point is one that demands attention. Assuming, however, that the question of finances is settled, what may the Diocese expect a Cathedral to do? and in what ways may the Church's hands be strengthened by such a foundation for the spiritual work entrusted to her? Whatever is to be said in favour of any departure from English precedent with regard to architecture, it is clear that what is needed in regard to the *functions* of a Cathedral, as distinct from its style, is a reversion to type, and a reappropriation under modern conditions of the original purposes for which Cathedrals were designed. To some extent the drifting away of our old Cathedrals from these purposes has been inevitable. Their situations in their respective dioceses, the growth and strength of the parochial system, the other channels of diocesan activity, and above all the complete change in their relations to the Bishop, have all tended to isolate them and to render them in many cases

¹ *Address*, p. 14.

rather
forces
the C
chap
of it
neces
of th
in Li
It we
Dioc
what
'mot
Dei,'
from
of d
thoug
thick
it is
one p
its o
pract
be of
Chur
inlon
only
the I
ship
of pr
distr
estim
felt.
best
much
main
servi
conte
Com
again
is slo
and
differ
forgo
of its
Ely s
celeb

dral in its building expressing the latter of course, before the endowment to pay in his worthy of the very have little dignity of but it is a hands given altogether ident one ore realize and of the is for the structure he means which will part from indebted t sugges- from the the point ; that the se expect h's hands tual work ur of any hitecture, functions version to ns of the ned. To rals from is in their parochial and above hop, have any cases

rather important elements in a particular locality than active forces in the religious life of a whole Diocese. But originally the Cathedral was the mother church of the Diocese. Its chapter were the assessors of the Bishop, the main purpose of its existence was missionary, and as this became less necessary its educative office was evolved. Along each one of these lines we believe it possible that a Cathedral church in Liverpool would make its influence felt with good result. It would be the visible centre of the religious life of the Diocese, expressing by the dignity and scale of its structure what is implied in the common service of God. As the 'mother church,' though latest born, as not only the 'Domus Dei,' but also the spiritual home of the Diocese, it would from time to time gather within its walls men and women of different ranks and callings and of different ways of thought. A Diocese like that of Liverpool, small in area, thickly populated, with a railway system so complete that it is an easy and an inexpensive matter to pass from any one parish to any other, has obvious possibilities of realizing its own corporate existence in ways which are far less practicable in Truro or Carlisle. A great Cathedral would be of effective benefit in the assertion of the unity of the Church as realized in the Bishop's See: 'ὅπου ἂν φανῇ ὁ ἐπίσκοπος, ἐκεῖ τὸ πλῆθος ἔστω' is a principle which not only takes the Bishop round his Diocese, but lays also upon the Diocese an obligation to maintain its conscious fellowship as opportunity allows. To this end a noble house of praise and prayer would exert an influence in several distinct ways, and only when the whole collective result is estimated can its importance as a power for unity be rightly felt. Here, for example, might the whole Diocese find the best expression of its common worship. In an age that is much given to liturgical variety, how beneficial is the constant maintenance of a dignified, reverent, and elevated type of service, neither ignoring nor exaggerating ritual, neither content with less nor demanding more than the Book of Common Prayer, and forming so an abiding protest alike against deficiencies and against additions, against whatsoever is slovenly and against whatsoever strikes plain folk as trivial and devoid of dignity. Towards such a type, while the different possibilities of different parishes need never be forgotten, the whole Diocese might be drawn by the example of its mother church, and so the old Cathedral rule of the Ely statutes, 'singulis diebus Laus Dei cantu et jubilatione celebretur,' should find abundant justification in the spread

of a common order and reverence from this as its centre and its source. In the Cathedral, too, of such a Diocese a very numerous list of annual services would be possible. The great Church societies would all have their own particular objects pleaded from its pulpit. Different guilds and associations might realize how their work was linked to the whole Church's activity by assembling from time to time for a united festival; while upon the days which were marked out, whether for the nation, the city, or the Church, as days of special thanksgiving or special mourning, the occasion would receive adequate recognition in its religious aspect by the appropriate service. The Cathedral, too, might be the centre of organization. Our readers will probably remember the strong faith of the late Archbishop Benson in the possibility of reviving the conciliar functions of Cathedrals; it appeared to him that they represented a power that had been suffered to fade away, and that 'to the reviving corporate unities of the English Church in her Dioceses strong and responsible Chapters must be the centres of force.' The maxim that 'unity is strength' might well be applied to diocesan organization, and anyone who considers the number and variety of the boards, councils, committees, and associations through which the practical administration of Church affairs is carried on might well believe that an increased measure of co-ordination and inter-relationship would prove of advantage. Necessarily different as the details of such an arrangement would be in different cases, the general principle of concentrating the activities of the Diocese around the Cathedral, and of their uniting diocesan dignity with diocesan service, might, we believe, even in the case of the ancient Cathedrals, be carried sometimes much further than it is, while in the case of a new and compact Diocese, such as that in question, there are obvious opportunities and an open field for the attempt.

From the more general functions of the Cathedral as a whole, we turn to the special offices which would naturally be attached to the residentiary canonries. Through a variety of causes it has come about that this position has for long been regarded in the popular estimate as the prize of a successful ministry rather than as the opportunity for future service. The main contention of Sydney Smith's witty letters to Archdeacon Singleton is that residentiary canonries are a gain to the Church because the profession of Holy Orders without such prizes would be less attractive to men of birth or ability. They were, as he thought, the 'splendid hope' of

the c
effect
What
woul
canon
incon
there
prim
were
Ely
scrib
resid
the r
with
strati
then
the n
healt
a gr
not t
disti
possi
exan
Arch
a car
that
him.
tirel
dral
woul
fices
'Res
rule,
sepa
an i
woul
I
its o
and
Glor
miss
year
in i
grea

the curate, so that the younger clergy of his day were in effect paid once by money and three times by expectation. What proportion of the unbeneficed clergy of the present would be glad to barter away their chances of a residentiary canonry for the solid addition of 450*l.* per annum to their incomes we do not propose to inquire, but we are sure that there are strong reasons against regarding such positions as primarily of the nature of a reward. Their higher purposes were implicitly acknowledged by the Dean and Chapter of Ely when, in reply to the Commissioners in 1855, they described the existing conditions in the following terms: 'The residence required by them [the statutes] is extremely short; the residentiary canons 'have no duties which connect them with the Diocese, with public education, or with the administration of the affairs of the Church.' At the same date the then Bishop of Salisbury declared his conviction that some of the most vital interests of our religion were bound up with a healthy, vigorous Cathedral system. We believe there is now a growing feeling among Churchmen that residence ought not to mean nine months' absence, and that the association of distinct diocesan duties with these positions would, where it is possible, be of great advantage to the Church's work. The example of the late Primate is well worth recalling. The Archbishop felt it against his conscience to hold a living and a canonry at the same time, and it was mainly on that ground that he declined the living of Dorking when it was offered him. We are convinced that the Bishop of Liverpool is entirely right when, in sketching the organization of the Cathedral as he hopes it will one day be, he says, 'Attached to it would be a staff of Cathedral clergy, not holding other benefices, but living and working entirely for the diocese.'¹ 'Residentia debet esse laboriosa non desidiosa' ran the old rule, and if the Diocese is wise it will regard the provision of separate houses and adequate stipends for the canonries as an important item in the scheme. We are sure the outlay would be justified by results.

In this way, for example, the Cathedral might revert to its original function as a foundation for missionary purposes, and a permanent Canon Missioner be attached to it, as at Gloucester, Truro, Ripon, and in other cases. If parochial missions are somewhat less in vogue than they were fifteen years ago, at least the cause of foreign missions has increased in its claim upon the National Church. Our duty to the great empire that lies beyond the seas, as well as to the whole

¹ *Address*, p. 17.

heathen world, is one that is pleaded with a noble enthusiasm and diligence by our great missionary societies. And in the fostering of this interest there would be ample room, without risk of overlapping, for the work of a Canon Missioner, who would represent the recognition by the Diocese as a whole, and not merely in its various divisions, of the Church's obligation to expansive and aggressive work. Within the Diocese he would naturally organize from among the parochial clergy a body of those who were able and fitted to conduct Quiet Days or to undertake Parochial Missions or a course of Addresses during Advent or Lent. And as provision could be made there would also be under his supervision a smaller number of clergy who might be free to take charge of parishes during times of vacancy, or who might relieve incumbents during periods of ill-health or over-pressure. How much the Church would gain by such provision for times of special emergency has already elsewhere been proved by experience. The Diocese of Liverpool is, as has been observed, singularly compact, and intercourse between the clergy and exchange of pulpits is thus rendered easy. Yet even here it is not difficult to realize how much useful work might be done by a Canon Missioner who had the confidence of the parochial clergy, and who was free from time to time to visit the incumbents in their parishes, not on special occasions, but spending from Friday to Monday as their guest, and encouraging both them and their people by sermon and address and personal intercourse and by such counsel and advice in all points of difficulty as a wide comparative experience would enable him to give. The possession of such an office would undoubtedly prove of great benefit, though we could imagine it being difficult to find exactly the man who would be able to utilize the great opportunities of such a position to their full extent. To different men it would be natural to work on different lines and by different methods; we have only attempted to sketch in outline some of the possibilities of such a canonry as an element in the missionary work of the Diocese.

The educational influence which might be exerted by such a Cathedral as we have in mind would be of high value and meet an obvious want. Perhaps there is no sphere in which there is greater opportunity, none where wise guidance and supervision are more possible and more needed. '*Juventus in litteris liberaliter instituatur*' runs one of Henry VIII's Cathedral Charters, and the urgent need that the Church shall keep abreast of the intellectual developments of our

own ag-
tion i
the ex-
tion.' I

'Fr
'I cann
special
able ma
take a b
Educati
demand
all the
and vige
agencies
Church

Such a
to one
in the
sake, a
denomi
the poi
School
and the
would
Cathed
state o
which
versy, t
enthusi
efforts
and so
even wi
the mor

Mos
of such
candida
intention
be prov
Greek a
both ex
study an
of this r
injunctio
Chapter

own age may well rouse in thoughtful men earnest consideration if not anxiety. The Dean of Ely in his lecture makes the excellent suggestion of a Canonry of Religious Education.¹

'From the point of view of distinctly Church interests,' he urges, 'I cannot but think that if one of the Cathedral canonries were specially endowed, with the intention of placing in its stall a really able man, one who from wide experience and careful study could take a broad statesmanlike view of the whole subject of National Education, determined to protect jealously the English instinct and demand for a religious basis to all national training, and yet free from all the narrowing influence of clericalism, not only would new life and vigour be imparted to the direction of all Church educational agencies in the Diocese, but a higher and a nobler tone given to the Church's relations both with the State and Nonconformity.'

Such an oversight of religious education is actually attached to one of the canonries of Exeter, and the need for arousing in the Church a stronger interest in education for its own sake, and apart from the burning questions of system and denomination, is surely evident to everyone who has watched the points around which the struggle is concentrated in our School Board elections. The Diocesan Board of Education and the important work of the Diocesan Inspector of Schools would naturally be brought into definite relations with the Cathedral, and when the present anomalous and transitional state of our Elementary Education has given place to one which the country as a whole can accept without controversy, there might well arise among us a genuine educational enthusiasm which would welcome on their own merits the efforts of all true educationists of whatever denomination, and so afford to such a Canonry of Religious Education an even wider scope than seems possible under the conditions of the moment.

Most important of all, however, of the educational functions of such a Cathedral would be the training in Theology of candidates for Holy Orders. Burnet tells us that it was an intention of Cranmer's 'that in every Cathedral there should be provision made for readers and teachers of Divinity and of Greek and Hebrew; and a great number of students to be both exercised in the daily worship of God, and trained up in study and devotion, whom the Bishop might transplant out of this nursery into all parts of his Diocese.' And among the injunctions issued not many years after to certain Cathedral Chapters is a scheme for the delivery of a lecture on some

¹ *St. Nicholas at the Port*, p. 16.

subject of divinity thrice every week. Such work was the recognized function of the Chancellorship of a Cathedral in its ancient conception, and how highly the late Primate estimated the opportunity of establishing the Chancellor's school in Lincoln will be well remembered by all readers of his Life. If three hundred years ago and if thirty years ago there was a need for this work of training for the ministry, how greatly is that need increased to day! Perhaps of all the many problems with which the Church of England is confronted at the present moment, none is more serious than that of the supply of men for Orders, and many a Bishop is familiar with the alternative of having to leave curacies vacant or of admitting to the ministry men of a calibre that is not, if we speak candidly, adequate to the work. As the supply from the old Universities falls short and as non-graduate theological colleges find their numbers and standard difficult to maintain, it is wise for the Church to consider what avenues are open to her ministry through the educational foundations of the great cities. In our last number we suggested what we believe to be the right policy.¹ King's College is such an avenue in London, and in the younger Universities, in the colleges which in Manchester, Liverpool and Leeds form the Victoria University, or in the newly constituted University of Birmingham, there are other opportunities to which the Church will do well to be alive. It is true these Universities may be prevented by their statutes from affording distinct theological training. But if it were possible for their students to supplement the Arts course of their curriculum by an after period of training for the ministry in the same locality, or even to carry on the two simultaneously, there would be at once a recognized facility for taking Orders offered to men whose homes were in these cities without great outlay of expense. An extension of such a scheme we believe is already contemplated for enabling the residents at the Bishop's Hostel in Ripon to take their degree from the Yorkshire College in Leeds. There is thus an obvious reason for expecting that men from the University College of Liverpool—or, as it may be ere long, the University of Liverpool—will find in the new Cathedral foundation an opportunity of theological training. The creation of a Canonry for this express purpose would be one of the most valuable adjuncts of a Cathedral church, and the provision of a sufficient staff of lecturers should not be impossible to arrange. We are fully aware that the difficulty of the supply of candidates for the ministry depends upon

¹ See *Church Quarterly Review*, vol. lii. July 1901, p. 576.

k was the
 athedral in
 e Primate
 hancellor's
 ders of his
 s ago there
 istry, how
 of all the
 and is con-
 s than that
 is familiar
 acant or of
 not, if we
 apply from
 theological
 o maintain,
 s are open
 ons of the
 d what we
 is such an
 ties, in the
 s form the
 niversity of
 the Church
 ies may be
 theological
 to supple-
 after period
 or even to
 at once a
 men whose
 of expense.
 ready con-
 's Hostel in
 College in
 ecting that
 r, as it may
 in the new
 al training.
 se would be
 church, and
 ould not be
 ne difficulty
 ends upon
 p. 576.

causes that lie far deeper than the mere question of ready
 avenues and facilities for qualification. The problem, indeed,
 is not how to train, so much as how to obtain the material for
 training. But over and above that is the urgent necessity
 that the men who are admitted to Orders shall be as well
 fitted for their sacred calling as may be, and also that after
 Ordination they shall not lose at once, in the pressing routine
 of parochial duties, all desire for intellectual self-culture and
 all resolve to keep abreast of the movement of the mind of
 their own generation. The Bishop of Liverpool has already
 worked with such noble result in the preparation of Oxford
 men for the ministry of the Church of Christ, that we are sure
 he will regard such a school of theology as one of the pro-
 minent advantages of his Cathedral that is to be. '*Ne
 pretiosa nostra vilescent et ministri sint sic in contemptum*'
 suggests a contingency fraught with grievous dangers, and all
 that fits men intellectually as well as spiritually for the high
 calling of the pastoral office is true service of the Church.

Such are some of the lines along which the influence of a
 Cathedral would be felt throughout the Diocese. As a noble
 and central House of Praise and Prayer it will stand as a
 tribute of the twentieth century to the life of the Spirit and
 the claim of God. It will uplift men's souls in an age of
 material possessions by the very cross of gold upon its dome
 or the direction of its spires. Within it there will be open to
 all who seek it the constant order of the Church's worship,
 in which what is best in ritual and best in music shall not fail
 to lend their aid. As a type of the true Church which is
 comprehensive beyond distinction of party, it will gather
 within its walls men whose opinions are diverse and whose
 training has led them different ways. Its services will be
 arranged both for the multitudes and for the few who come
 together in their Master's name. The toilers of the vast city
 in which it stands shall learn to love it as their own, and tired
 women shall rest in its solemn atmosphere as they pass upon
 their way. There the traveller from the high seas shall pay his
 vows, and there the sense of life's spiritual purpose may come
 again to the man who has lost his faith. The training of
 young lives, the rousing of the indifferent, the spread of the
 Gospel in far countries, the maintenance of a high type of
 worship, the deepening of intellectual seriousness, the revival
 of interest in the Church's story, the fitting of men for the
 ministry, the adequate expression for Church or city of the
 emotion of great moments, the memorials of what was noblest
 in citizenship, the manifold services of organization and wise

policy, the voices that have the power of moving men to higher things shall all find their meeting-place, both as source and centre, in this new House of God. Who shall measure the gain of unity, the added inspiration, the strengthened influences to which the fulfilment of this project by the blessing of God may prove the means?

The late Archbishop Benson, if we may once more quote the words of so convinced an enthusiast in the Cathedral cause, was wont from a boy to pray that God would revive the spirit which built Cathedrals, and, however different the conditions of the twentieth century are from those of the twelfth or thirteenth, it is still true that the task can only be carried out with true success when its spiritual character is realised by the generation who set their hands to build. For it will involve much co-operation, and much self-sacrifice; it will mean the deliberate desire to place the building of God's House before increased domestic luxury; it will demand from the parochial clergy a conscious and sustained effort to find room, amid many other competing claims, for the support of a great diocesan project; it may be wrecked or curtailed if men are not willing for a time to forget theological differences and varieties of architectural taste; it may be marred by impatience; its ultimate usefulness may be limited if there be not generous provision for the maintenance both of fabric and services, and for the support of a staff of clergy qualified for their responsible positions; it cannot be built by civic ambition devoid of other motives, and it will need the liberality of the border parishes of the Diocese, as well as of those which lie within the sound of the Cathedral bells. Well has the Bishop told his Diocese that the undertaking is a great one, and that it will demand a united, sustained, and prayerful effort. We are glad to see the scheme started under such happy auspices. We commend it to the attention and good will of the Church at large. And we are convinced that in the heart of a great modern city, overlooking the noble river on which ships and men and the wealth of a world-wide commerce so constantly come and go, standing as the highest expression of the religious life of a community that has already expressed, in Institution, Hall, and University, its philanthropic, civic, and intellectual aims, the Cathedral church of Liverpool will thus rise up as a noble witness of the Unseen and the Spiritual and the Christ that is more and more to be, so that as the after generations come into possession they shall look back with gratitude to those who built it, and once again in the history of human life the House of the Lord shall not have been built in vain.

1. *The*

T

2. *The*

JA

(H

3. *Lif*

C

B

18

4. *Dic*

18

WE an

genera

secular

eightee

centres

appreci

Wesley

known

has at a

tical.

The

and rel

of succ

century

of quar

interest

greatest

unable

her roof

two fam

Moravia

Mother

of Staur

whose n

do not c

The

house o

ancestry

during t

period t

VOL.

ART. IV.—JOHN GAMBOLD, POET AND MORAVIAN BISHOP.

1. *The Works of the Rev. John Gambold, A.M.*, etc. By THOMAS ERSKINE, ESQ. (Glasgow, 1823.)
2. *The Life of the Rev. John Gambold.* By the Rev. BENJAMIN LA TROBE, prefixed to an edition of his works. (Bath, 1789.)
3. *Life and Labours of the Rev. John Gambold, A.M., of Christ Church College, Oxford, First Bishop of the United Brethren in England.* By DANIEL BENHAM. (London, 1865.)
4. *Dictionary of National Biography.* Vol. XX. (London, 1889.)

WE are in danger sometimes in our desire for historical generalization of forgetting the undercurrents of religious and secular life. We condemn the religious coldness of the eighteenth century. We forget its many small and obscure centres of piety, often all the more intense because neither appreciated nor capable of expansion. We remember the Wesleyans, we forget the Moravians. Yet it is these less known communities which have been the seed-plots for what has at a later date been more conspicuous and more practical.

The life and views of a deeply religious man of learning and refinement, who voluntarily resigned his great prospects of success in the Church of England during the eighteenth century, and who yet vigorously denied that he had any cause of quarrel with the Established Church, must surely be of interest to many even at the present day. If it is one of the greatest misfortunes of the English Church that she was unable to find room for John and Charles Wesley beneath her roof, here we have a man, who was fully the equal of the two famous brothers both in piety and learning, joining the Moravian sect while openly still professing admiration for his Mother Church. Such is the case of John Gambold, ex-vicar of Staunton-Harcourt and Bishop of the 'Unitas Fratrum,' whose name and career are now little remembered, and yet do not deserve to be allowed to sink entirely into oblivion.

The Gambolds—said to be descendants of the old knightly house of Bold of St. Dogmael's, who claimed a common ancestry with the royal Tudors—were resident in Cardigan during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, during which period their name occurs frequently in the parish registers of

St. Mary's Church. Of this family, evidently of some position in the town, was the Rev. William Gambold, born in 1672, the father of the subject of this sketch. This William Gambold, after graduating at Exeter College, Oxford, became vicar of Puncteston—a corruption of Poyntz-town—a remote village at the foot of the Preselley Mountains in Pembrokeshire. He was a man of considerable ability, a friend of Edward Lloyd, the Welsh antiquary, as well as 'an ornament to his profession, well-known and respected alike for his unaffected piety and purity of manners.' He is still remembered in Welsh literature as an able scholar and translator, and a Welsh grammar, published by him in 1727, is still in use in various schools in Wales at the present day. William Gambold died in 1728, leaving five sons and one daughter. Of these the eldest was John Gambold, born April 10, 1711, whom his father had himself educated in the humble parsonage at Puncteston before entering him as a servitor at Christ Church, Oxford, at the age of fifteen. Possibly the wild, remote district of Preselley with its wide melancholy views of mountains, moor and sea may have left its mark on the shy young scholar, and bred in him his later dislike for 'the polite world.'

At Oxford, however, John Gambold soon attracted attention by his undoubted ability and by the sweetness of his disposition :

'His proficiency was remarkable, especially in his compositions. He was naturally of a lively and active spirit, and the time he could spare from those studies which he was obliged to pursue in the college, he chose to spend in reading the most approved authors of poetry and plays.'

But this innocent taste for something lighter than religious exercises was abandoned as vain and sinful after the death of his father, whose dying exhortations had so powerful an effect upon his eldest son's dormant Puritan nature, that henceforward John Gambold determined to renounce 'all the pleasures he had received from books calculated to gratify the taste of the polite world' ! Thus, from a morbid sense of his own wickedness and unfitness, this boy of seventeen may be said to have determined to ruin his career from a material point of view ; and by this renunciation of 'the world' the Church of England some years later undoubtedly lost a valuable preacher and scholar, as well as a poet of no small merit.

On returning to Oxford after his father's death Gambold not only resumed his studies but began to make acquaintance with 'those students of the university who in obedience to the

some possible, born in his William Ford, became a remote Pembroke. a friend of an ornament for his unremembered translator, and a still in use in William Gambold's daughter. Of April 10, 1711, a humble parson's servitor at Possibly the melancholy its mark on a dislike for

tracted attention of his dis-

compositions. time he could pursue in the of authors of

than religious the death of a powerful effect that henceforth the pleasure of the taste of of his own may be said material point of the Church's a valuable small merit. with Gambold's acquaintance to the

dictates of pure religion were then distinguished from others by a laudable singularity in their conduct,' *i.e.* John and Charles Wesley with their friends and followers. But the vigour and enthusiasm of the Revivalists did not present such attractions to Gambold as might have been expected. Quiet and meditation were essential to his mind, so that he had little in common with the public preachings and emotional piety of the Wesleys. Still, it is interesting to learn that a man so deeply religious and so thoroughly imbued with the sense of sin as Gambold not only knew the Wesleys intimately at Oxford, but in many ways followed their example in teaching poor children, in ministering to the sick, in visiting the prisoners in Oxford Castle and in Bocardo Gaol, and in abstaining from a normal allowance of meat and drink 'to the intent that he might feel the wants of others in distress and mortify the corrupt affections and desires of his own depraved nature.'

During this period of his life Gambold studied deeply the writings of the Fathers of the Church, and so excellent and enthusiastic a Greek scholar did he become in his researches that

'his company was very agreeable to all who knew him; and every one was gratified who could hear a man of the eighteenth century converse like one of those of the second or third of the Christian era. . . . They were led back to the distance of fifteen hundred years into the contemplation of axioms, sentences, and complete thoughts clothed in the most elegant dress of language and the most delicate turn of expression. His abilities both natural and acquired were great, but his unfeigned humility was so apparent to every one with whom he conversed that his superior powers of pleasing excited no sensation of dislike in any.'

In spite of his deep-seated religious melancholy, and in spite too of his friendship with 'the whimsical Mr. Charles Wesley,' and consequent connexion with the Methodists, John Gambold was much appreciated by the leading men of Oxford. In 1731, though still under age, he was admitted to Holy Orders by Bishop Potter and given the post of Chaplain at Christ Church; in 1734 he took his degree as Master of Arts, and in 1739 he was instituted to the vicarage of Staunton-Harcourt by Dr. Secker, then Bishop of Oxford. This living was given to Gambold by Lord Harcourt, a persistent admirer and would-be friend of the gentle, dreamy young parson, whom he frequently invited over to Nuneham Park (of which the beautiful woods extending to the Isis are so well known to all Oxonians, past and present).

Sunk in the retirement of Staunton-Harcourt, Gambold shunned as far as possible all intercourse with the outer world, and in spite of the appreciation of his talents and piety could rarely be prevailed upon to visit any of his friends or, rather, well-wishers. As might be expected, he made a good parish priest, serving his flock diligently and setting an excellent, if somewhat unpractical, example in all things. In the vicarage his sister, Martha Gambold, kept house for him, assisted, strange to relate, by Keziah Wesley, sister of John and Charles.

In 1737, some two years before removing to Staunton-Harcourt, Gambold made the acquaintance of Brother Peter Boehler, of the 'Unitas Fratrum' or Moravian Fraternity, who was then on a visit to England before proceeding thence to America. From London Boehler was invited by the Wesleys to Oxford, where he gave discourses to 'the awakened people' in Latin, which John Gambold translated and expounded on the spot to the audience, so great was his skill in the dead languages. Boehler, writing to Count Zinzendorf, says of his scholarly exponent at Oxford: 'I became acquainted with a country clergyman named Gambold, who had been described to me as a true Hernhutter, and who undoubtedly mortified himself. In aspect he was a perfect mystic.' The addresses and arguments of Peter Boehler appealed so strongly to the mind of Gambold that, beginning to take a deep interest in the tenets and methods of the Moravians, he went up to London himself to meet and converse with the celebrated Count Zinzendorf. The Count had, as everyone knows, already founded his colony of Hernhutt on his own estate in Lusatia some years previously, and to this spot many believers and proselytes were constantly flocking, so that naturally the collection of so large a number of people who, however quiet and harmless they might be individually, nevertheless held strange religious and social views, was not viewed with favour by outsiders either at home or abroad. Many scandals and imputations, too, had been rumoured on all sides concerning the Count and his followers, and some distrust, arising from such reports, was evidently in Gambold's mind until his first interview with 'that servant of God' (Count Zinzendorf), when all suspicion and doubt seem to have vanished.

In spite of his personal acquaintance with the Count, however, Gambold did not as yet feel inclined to throw his lot in with the Brethren. He laboured on at Staunton-Harcourt, greatly encouraged by the warm approbation of

his b
prea
serm
Chan
Hect
coun
foun
induc
order
of se
'appl
distr
direc
office
Octo
Bisho
acqu
'I
Praye
light
and g
from
outwa
astica
kingd
who a
munic

I
unna
a mo
Churc
of ad
Secke
leadin
utmo
that I
of Et
in va
Lond
Churc
F
active
The
talent
ancie

Gambold the outer talents and any of his expected, he gently and ample in all bold, kept h Wesley,

Staunton-ther Peter Fraternity, ing thence ed by the s to 'the translated eat was his to Count xford: 'I med Gam- ternhutter, ect he was s of Peter bold that, d methods lf to meet dorf. The his colony me years proselytes llection of d harmless ge religious y outsiders mputations, the Count from such first inter- dorf), when

the Count, throw his Staunton-robation of

his bishop and Lord Harcourt. On December 27, 1741, he preached before the University at St. Mary's, Oxford, his sermon being published at the special request of the Vice-Chancellor. But about this time Gambold's younger brother, Hector, becoming a Moravian convert, brought down to the country parsonage such glowing accounts of the newly-founded colony in England that his elder brother was induced again to come up to London himself and see the order lately established there. At last, after many months of self-communing, of wavering, of doubting, John Gambold 'applied to the United Brethren disposed as a little child in distress for help, committed himself to their care and direction, and had no choice with regard to any station or office wherein he might be of use to others.' This was in October 1742, in which month also Gambold wrote to Bishop Secker, to Lord Harcourt, and to his parishioners, acquainting them of his intention to resign his living:

'I find no fault with any passage or clause in the Common Prayer Book. Nor can I, in justice, be considered in the same light with such persons as slight and forsake one party of Christians and go over to another without sufficient cause. . . . I do not go from you because I cannot live in the Church of England, as an outward profession, or because I prefer any other form of ecclesiastical government before that which is by law established in this kingdom: but the inducement is . . . a free intercourse with those who are of the same principles with my own, to whom I can communicate my thoughts without reserve.'

It will be gathered from this that it was from an unnatural, but thoroughly genuine, humility, as well as from a morbid sense of his own unfitness, that Gambold left the Church of England, and thereby abandoned the certain hope of advancement; and it is greatly to the credit of Bishop Secker (afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury) and other leading Churchmen of the day at Oxford that they did their utmost to try and prove to the Vicar of Staunton-Harcourt that he was more than worthy of his position in the Church of England. Arguments and entreaties were, however, alike in vain; Gambold resigned his living and proceeded to London, where he was admitted a member of the Moravian Church on October 31, 1742.

From this time onward Gambold's life became far more active, and possibly more useful, than it had hitherto been. The Brethren certainly appreciated their new convert's talents, especially his wonderful gift of languages, both ancient and modern, and kept him hard at work, chiefly in

translating or revising German books for publication in England. Nevertheless, presumably on account of poverty, Gambold taught for some months at a boarding-school under the direction of the Brethren at Broadoaks, in Essex, lodging in the house of a Mrs. Claggett, a widow, whose daughters he used to instruct. This humiliating position of his former friend drew both lamentations and reproaches from Charles Wesley, who was disgusted with the Brethren for their influence over Gambold. In some bitter lines Wesley complains that Gambold

‘ Buries his ten talents in the ground,
Bids country friends and church and state farewell,
Sulks in a widow’s house, and teaches girls to spell !’

This period of teaching in schools lasted some little time, for in the following year Gambold was keeping a small school of his own in Haverfordwest, the county town of his native Pembrokeshire, having in the interval married Miss Elizabeth Walker, of Littleton, in Yorkshire, who was herself received into the Moravian communion shortly after her marriage.

From Haverfordwest Gambold came up to London in the latter part of 1744, where he was made regular minister of the newly-built Moravian church in Fetter Lane, which is still standing in almost exactly the same state as it was in those days, a building plain and unpretending, but of real historical interest both as the cradle of Moravianism in this country and as a place wherein such men as Zinzendorf, Spangenberg, and John Gambold have often preached. Here some three years were spent in preaching, writing and translating.

‘ He was useful in repeating extempore in English the sermons which the Count preached in German, and the translation was so well performed that every one who heard him and understood both languages wondered at the facility of his comprehension and the retentiveness of his memory.’

Early in the spring of 1747 Gambold paid his first visit to the Moravian settlement in Lusatia, being present at a general synod of the Brethren held in May at Hernhaag. Count Zinzendorf in a letter of this period wrote :

‘ Brother Gambold has derived much benefit from his stay among us at Hernhaag, and I was delighted to find this to be the case ; for no one could look at our English friend without seeing the misanthrope in his countenance !’

Returning to London in August Gambold resumed his various duties at the Fetter Lane Chapel, endeavouring,

1901 J
among
conver
Establi
their se
bishop.
posals
Sodor
to act
In
influen
govern
disting
some y
that it
Church
orders.
Gamb
Lindsa
was on
that th
positio
the ran
opinion
On
secreat
until t
and ch
scatter
Fo
Linds
at Fet
work,
the b
(publi
work
tribut
found
bound
visitin
the p
gener
lost t
too, t
the in
Wesl

among other attempts at organization, to form the English converts into an Anglican *tropus*, or sect attached to the Established Church, using the Book of Common Prayer at their services and continuing under the control of an Anglican bishop. This scheme naturally failed, though such a proposal commended itself to the good Dr. Wilson, Bishop of Sodor and Man, who is said to have expressed his willingness to act as patriarch to this Anglo-Moravian community.

In spite of this failure, however, Gambold had no little influence over Count Zinzendorf in all matters of Church government. It was probably in a great degree due to this distinguished English convert's exertions and advice that some years later, in 1754, the Brethren came to the conclusion that it was advisable to follow the traditions of the early Churches and to keep up a regular succession of ecclesiastical orders. The immediate outcome of this decision was that Gambold himself was nominated a bishop at a synod held at Lindsay House, the headquarters of the sect in London. It was only by much entreaty, and even by positive command, that the shy, retiring pastor could be induced to accept this position, for 'neither the regard which was shown him nor the rank which he held in the Church could alter that humble opinion he alway entertained of himself.'

On November 14, 1754, Gambold accordingly was consecrated by Bishop Johannes de Watteville, and henceforth, until the close of his life, continued to act himself as bishop and chief pastor of the fairly numerous Moravian communities scattered throughout England and Ireland.

For the next fourteen years Gambold chiefly resided at Lindsay House, managing the affairs of the Brethren, preaching at Fetter Lane Chapel, and yet finding time for much literary work, for during this period he superintended and corrected the beautiful and accurate edition of Lord Bacon's works (published by Bowyer in 1765), and also David Crantz's work on Greenland, to the latter of which he himself contributed a chapter dealing with the missions and settlements founded by the Moravian Brethren on those desolate, ice-bound shores. In 1765 Bishop Gambold was in Ireland, visiting and founding missions in various towns, having in the previous year attended, at Marienborn in Germany, a general synod of the Brethren, who had four years before lost their noble and distinguished founder. About this time, too, the long-standing quarrel with the Wesleys was ended at the instigation of Selina, Countess of Huntingdon, and John Wesley in his *Journal*, of September 5, 1763, writes: 'I spent

some time with my old friend Gambold. . . . Who but Count Zinzendorf could have separated such friends as we were? Shall we never unite again?' And again, on December 16, the same year: 'I spent an agreeable hour, and not unprofitably, in conversation with my old friend, John Gambold. O how gladly could I join heart and hand again! But alas! thy heart is not as my heart!'

Devotion to work, both literary and clerical, and long journeys to visit distant missions began in time to tell upon Gambold's nervous nature, so much so that after his second visit to Germany his health began to break down. Besides feeling the strain of his varied work, the Bishop began to suffer acutely from asthma, and so bad was his state in 1768, that at last his flock insisted on their beloved pastor leaving London and going down to his native Pembrokeshire for quiet and change of air. On August 16, therefore, Gambold, accompanied by his wife and family, left Lindsay House amid the tears of his London congregation, never to return.

Arrived at Haverfordwest, Gambold's health at first improved, but soon it became evident that the end could not be far distant. The Bishop bore all his sufferings—to which was now added dropsy—with perfect resignation and even thankfulness:

'There are very few intervals in the day wherein I have anything like strength either of mind or body. . . . I walk most days a little in the chapel or burying-ground, till I am ready to drop down. All that I can properly desire of my gracious Lord is that He would be merciful to me a sinner.'

In these last days of sickness and suffering the Brethren in London were most anxious to give their Bishop rest and peace in comfort, and freedom from all exertion; but these kindly offers Gambold firmly refused, declaring it to be his fixed intention to labour to the end. A letter, dated July 28, 1771, to the Brethren in London, in which he states that 'the constant prayer of my heart is for the welfare and prosperity of the Church of God, and especially that part of it which is the immediate object of our care,' was Gambold's last. Nevertheless he continued, during his brief intervals of rest from pain, both to visit the poor and dejected, and to converse with members of his Welsh congregation, at the same time performing his pastoral duties, and busying himself with writing a small work intended to be of benefit to young English clergymen anxious to acquire the Welsh language.

During these last months at Haverfordwest, Gambold, like Dean Swift, was much oppressed with the fear of losing

his re
his pu
last, a
day h
quent
verses
cease
less, s
exclai
come,
spirit

Jo
the ap
sides
last il
only
his d
Stein
Mary
Jame
herse

G
Mora
with
is sin
and p
Ther
know
a str
and
as w
ance
and
bisho

C
it is
class
appr
lectu
Gerr
scho
much
clerg
cella
little

his reason, on which subject he has left some verses among his published writings. But his mind remained clear to the last, and after taking to his bed on September 8, on which day he received his last public Communion, Gambold frequently sang 'with a cheerful though faltering voice some verses of praise and adoration.' At length these psalms ceased, and 'the lowly Bishop of his loving flock' lay speechless, struggling for breath. Before his death he was heard to exclaim, 'Dear Saviour! Remember my poor name; and come, come soon!' after which his gentle, humble, and gifted spirit returned to Him that gave it.

John Gambold died on Friday, September 13, 1771, at the age of sixty, leaving behind him a son and daughter, besides his widow who had nursed him tenderly through his last illness, and who died herself at Chelsea in 1803. His only surviving son, John, died without issue in 1795, while his daughter, Anna Mary, married in 1774 the Rev. John Steinhauer, by whom she had five children, one of whom, Mary, became the wife of Ignatius Montgomery, brother of James Montgomery, the well-known poet. Mrs. Steinhauer herself died at Gracehill in Ireland in 1809.

Gambold's portrait was painted by Abelard Brandt, the Moravian artist, who represented his sitter in clerical dress with a bag-wig, and with hands clasped together. The face is singularly refined and intellectual; the eyes are large, blue, and prominent; the folded hands have long tapering fingers. There is a fine engraving from this picture by Spilsbury, well known to collectors. Certain people have professed to notice a strong resemblance between the portraits of Dr. Johnson and Bishop Gambold, but, except that both are represented as wearing similar wigs, there is nothing common in appearance or mien between the massive features of the great doctor and the delicate, nervous face and frame of the Moravian bishop.

Considering John Gambold from a literary point of view, it is true to say that he was certainly one of the most brilliant classical scholars of his day. His wonderful knowledge and appreciation of Greek, which were so admired by the intellectual world of Oxford, have already been noticed; he spoke German fluently, and, like his father, was also a good Welsh scholar, writing and speaking the vernacular with ease, and much lamenting its neglect by certain of the English-speaking clergy in Wales. Setting aside sermons and a mass of miscellaneous tracts and letters on religious subjects, there is little left of Gambold's writings to interest readers in the

present day, and even this little savours indirectly of religious thought, for our author, as we have already shown, had renounced at a very early age all intention of pleasing the 'polite world.' Nevertheless his works have sunk into a complete neglect which is not wholly justified, and certain of his poems deserve to be better known.

Gambold's writings—or rather a selection of them—were published posthumously in 1789, prefaced by a sympathetic memoir of their author by the Rev. Benjamin La Trobe, of the United Brethren, which has been quoted frequently in this sketch. This volume contains the Christmas sermon preached at St. Mary's, Oxford, in 1741; sermons, and extracts from sermons, preached at Fetter Lane Chapel; some private letters; a drama, *Ignatius*; and, lastly, a few poems and hymns. With these two latter—the drama and the fugitive verses—we alone have to deal.

The drama of *Ignatius* was written in Gambold's early Oxford days, when his mind was filled with the writings of the Fathers of the Church. The subject is the martyrdom of St. Ignatius, Bishop of Antioch, who was brought, by order of the Emperor Trajan, from his own city to Rome, where he was eventually torn in pieces by wild beasts in the Colosseum. Both Ignatius and Polycarp are introduced, with numerous references to their great teacher, St. John. It is a crude, rather morbid work, but so full of fine thoughts and really eloquent passages that we can but regret the direction of Gambold's talents in certain instances. In his later years even this sacred drama seemed to savour of the wickedness of the stage in its author's eyes, and, had not the manuscript been in the possession of a friend, *Ignatius* would doubtless have never seen the light. As it was, it was published for the first time in Mr. La Trobe's book eighteen years after Gambold's death.

Two passages, taken almost at random, will give the reader a fair idea of Gambold's easy-flowing blank verse, and of the spirit of this fine but unequal work.

'*Polycarp.*

Is it partiality, or is it insight

Into the system of a dear friend's conduct,
That makes each little thing he says or does

Speak more to us than others are aware of?
But so it is. I see the holiness

Of John not only in his elevations

That struck mankind, but even where he seemed

T'express the human and the frailer side.

Thus in his playing, to unbend the mind,

And
Igna

an
dev

fug
po
sty
Dis
adv
nat

sin
th
w
au
m

With a tame partridge, there's a tacit slur
 On mortal care, as if he said, "Be easy ;
 Your projects and this play meet in a point."
 So when old man, for lack of memory
 And matter, as it seemed, he oft repeated
 One lesson, "Love the Brethren"—'twas, we know,
 A thought extracted from a world of thinking.'

And again, Agathopus, speaking of his martyred Bishop, Ignatius, says :

'He was a man so pure in private life,
 So all-devoted to the things above,
 So mere a servant both of Christ and men :
 You'd say he acted without spark of nature,
 Save that each motion flowed with ease and beauty.
 Then such a pastor was he, so intent
 To guard from errors and build up in Christ
 (In wisdom, innocence, and unity)
 Each simple soul ; so gentle too therein,
 No heart but blessed itself it had a father.'

Quite unintentionally in these lines Gambold has written an accurate description of his own unselfish life and of the devotion in which his own flock held him.

Leaving *Ignatius* and turning to the dozen or more fugitive pieces published in Mr. La Trobe's book, we find six poems in the heroic metre, didactic and semi-religious, in style not unlike Cowper's. Of these the longest is 'Religious Discourse,' which contains some shrewd hints and good advice to the would-be preacher, pleading especially for a natural method of speaking and teaching.

'All rules are dead ; 'tis from the heart you draw
 The living lustre, and unerring law.
 A state of thinking in your manner shew,
 Not fiercely soaring, nor supinely low :
 Others their lightness and each inward fault
 Quench in the stillness of your deeper thought.
 Let all your gestures fix attention draw,
 And wide around infuse infectious awe ;
 Present with God by recollection seem,
 Yet present, by your cheerfulness, with them.'

Of the remaining pieces 'The Corrective'—containing a simile from the contents of an apothecary's shop—savours of the influence of George Herbert, with whose works Gambold was no doubt acquainted. Another poem deals with the author's fears of approaching madness, in which he begs men :

'With decent heed revere
 Your poor unliving brother here :
 For why is censure spent in vain
 On deeds of incoherent brain ?
 Those under no account can fall,
 Or, if they can, are sealed up all :
 For, though on earth this spectre roam,
 He's of no world, but that to come.'

But the pearl of all Gambold's poems is undoubtedly his beautiful 'Mystery of Life,' acquaintance with which can only make us deplore that its author has not written more in the same strain. This poem (which is quoted in full by the late Miss Ferrier in her novel of *Marriage*, and which is contained, so far as we know, in only one collection of lyrics) contains in its last verse the same grand idea that is to be found in Robert Browning's 'Abt Vogler'—that the failures of this world will bring their full success in the next, 'where all pursuits their goal obtain.' This piece, both for its merit and the oblivion into which it has sunk, demands quotation in full :

So many years I've seen the sun,
 And call'd these eyes and hands my own,
 A thousand little acts I've done,
 And childhood have and manhood known ;
 O what is life ! and this dull round
 To tread, why was a spirit bound ?

So many airy draughts and lines,
 And warm excursions of the mind,
 Have fill'd my soul with great designs,
 While practice grovelling'd far behind ;
 O what is thought ! and where withdraw
 The glories which my fancy saw ?

So many tender joys and woes
 Have on my quivering soul had power ;
 Plain life with height'ning passions rose,
 The boast or burden of the hour ;
 O what is all we feel ! why fled
 Those pains and pleasures o'er my head ?

So many human souls divine,
 So at one interview display'd,
 So oft and freely mix'd with mine,
 In lasting bonds my heart have laid ;
 O what is friendship ! why imprest
 On my weak, wretched, dying breast ?

Th
 sonal
 'Epi

Let

It
 Tr
 sto
 wh
 an
 of

So many wondrous gleams of light,
And gentle ardors from above,
Have made me sit, like seraph bright,
Some moments on a throne of love ;
O what is virtue ! why had I,
Who am so low, a taste so high ?

Ere long, when sovereign wisdom wills,
My soul an unknown path shall tread,
And strangely leave, who strangely fills
This frame, and waft me to the dead ;
O what is death ! 'tis life's last shore,
Where vanities are vain no more ;
Where all pursuits their goal obtain,
And life is all retouched again ;
Where in their bright result shall rise
Thoughts, virtues, friendships, griefs, and joys.'

This imperfect sketch of a saintly and interesting personality may be fittingly concluded by Gambold's humble 'Epitaph on Himself' :

Ask not, who ended here his span ?
His name, reproach and praise, was man.
Did no great deeds adorn his course ?
No deed of his, but show'd him worse :
One thing was great, which God supplied,
He suffered human life—and dy'd.
What points of knowledge did he gain ?
That life was sacred all—and vain ;
Sacred how high, and vain how low ?
He knew not here, but dy'd to know.

ART. V.—THE LETTERS OF MADAME DE SÉVIGNÉ.

Lettres de Madame de Sévigné, de sa Famille et de ses Amis : recueillies et annotées. Par M. MONMERQUÉ, Membre de l'Institut. (Paris, 1862, &c.)

It is the gift of genius to tell the truth in an original way. Truth is one and error is manifold, and to tell again an old story is too often to tell it wrong. That, however, is a danger which criticism has to face ; for a large part of its business, and not the least useful or necessary, is precisely this telling of old stories, restating old decisions, new publishing old

fame. It is true that observance of the laws and traditions of the elders does not easily or commonly lead to anything very interesting, either in literature or in life. Yet in both alike it is the only basis on which to build. If life is to be sound as well as interesting it must manage to walk the ancient roads, though its steps may not, and indeed must not, be quite like the ancient steps. To do the old things, and yet to have a new way of doing them, to take the old thoughts, laws, customs, institutions, and transform them, touch them to new life till they are the same and yet not the same, is the hard business of life as well as of politics. And the not less hard business of literature is to say the old things and yet have a new way of saying them. To ask this is perhaps to ask the impossible, but after all most of the serious things in life are attempts to reach a goal, of which those who are most earnest in the attempt are just those who best know the ultimate unattainableness. Criticism, at any rate, can never afford to resign its right to insist on winning some attention for old claims too easily forgotten, and to urge the plain truth, so little known at the circulating libraries, that the question whether a book is worth reading is by no means to be answered by its newness, the extent of its sale, or the amount of talk that is to be heard about it, but by considerations of quite another order to these. We all take ourselves seriously nowadays, with or without reason, and certainly the critic has as good a right to do so as other people. His function is in the field of literature what the preacher's is in ethics and theology. Both have constantly to repeat what is very old, and it is their highest duty. But it must be no vain repetition. The new must be there as well as the old. He who knows only the old will have but few hearers to listen to him. He who knows only the new will infallibly be a heretic and a trainer of heretics.

So, in this way, those who write about books may, and indeed must, write sometimes of the great old books as well as of those among the new which seem to have the best chance of being great in their turn. It is a duty as well as a pleasure to disturb from time to time the sacred dust which rests in so many libraries on the shelves which contain the classics of the seventeenth century. There they all are, Clarendon and Cowley, Hobbes and Locke, Corneille and Racine, Pascal and Bossuet, remnants of a stately age, now ranked in tall and stately repose on the walls of silent libraries. How many of us have the courage or the wisdom to awake them? A few of their companions, too great to share their

sleep
Fon
desk
from
and
safe
says
a hu
read
Imm
com
by,
atte
out.
as w
mak
very
a s
Sév
the
of t
Let
of l
wis
enjo
lady
com
com
with
aliv

first
pag
the
The
forg
the
sell
rep
not
hur
was
to
of

sleep—Milton and Dryden, perhaps, and Molière, and La Fontaine—are still, we may hope, often on the table or the desk; but for the rest, they stand unmoved in their places from January to June, and then again from June to January.

Probably Madame de Sévigné, for all her old popularity and her many editions, is now become one of these. She is safe; 'c'est une belle chose qu'une vieille lettre,' as she herself says; nothing can touch her; she will be on the shelves still a hundred years hence, but she will probably be less and less read as each generation goes by. For though an unquestioned Immortal she belongs to the humbler ranks of her high company. And that means that, as years and centuries go by, and new claimants appear who have a right to our attention, she, like others of her rank, is apt to be crowded out. Only those, as a rule, who have a great deal of leisure as well as a great deal of love of literature will now find or make time to read her. But she is still worth reading, and very well worth reading, for those who can and will give her a score of winter afternoons. 'Lisons tout Madame de Sévigné,' was Sainte-Beuve's precept during the sad end of the Franco-German war. Edward FitzGerald had a habit of taking her up every year with the return of the spring. Let us follow their example; look out for some old edition of her, going, as they do, for a few shillings; retrench some wise hours from those we now give to the newspapers; and enjoy ourselves for a while with this charming old 'great lady' of the France of two hundred years ago, so full of common sense and natural affection, so far, indeed, beyond the common human attainment in either; so intimately acquainted with so interesting a world, so intelligent, so humorous, so alive.

We shall find plenty to interest us, if we will. There are, first of all—no mean interest—the people who appear in her pages, what she herself hears them say or sees them do, or the stories she tells of them at quite contemporary first-hand. They are people, many of them, not likely to be soon forgotten. Louis XIV. is among them, and his Queen, and the other ladies whose names are linked with his; Mademoiselle de la Vallière, in her beauty, her sin, and her saintly repentance; Madame de Montespan, in the pride that could not learn to fall; Madame de Maintenon, in the shrewd humility that knew so well how to rise. La Rochefoucauld was among her intimate friends, and she may almost be said to have been present at his death-bed, so minute is her account of the scene. She is full of Pascal and all the men of Port

Royal, though of their writings rather than of themselves; and there are small contemporary glimpses, quite worth getting, of Racine and Boileau, Corneille and Bossuet, Bourdaloue and Fénelon. Our own James II. and Mary of Modena make a great figure in her letters for a while when they and their misfortunes were new; and her readers remember James by a good thing said at his expense, and the Queen by a good thing of her own. The politicians are there too, Cardinal de Retz and Fouquet, and De Pomponne, and Colbert and Louvois, some of whom she knew well, of all of whom there was much talk in her world; and the famous soldiers, Condé, whose great entertainment and unhappy cook fill one of her best known letters, and Turenne, whose death remains her subject for weeks; and the courtiers, our English Madame whom she never forgets, and her German successor, and the young princes, and Bussy, and Lauzun, and all that world whose happiness, and sometimes its liberty, depended on the shining of the Roi Soleil. Such a company of famous personages is no mean advantage to a book of letters. It tells enormously, for instance, in Madame de Sévigné's favour against some of her English compeers, as, for example, Cowper. We are not interested in Mrs. Unwin till Cowper compels us to be; it needs no art to interest us in Madame de Maintenon.

And yet it is not her *dramatis personæ* that have kept Madame de Sévigné alive for two hundred years. If it were, her letters would only be material for literature, not what they in fact are, fine literature themselves. Nor have they survived, as some have done, for the good things they contain. There are many good things in them, no doubt—the famous remark, of which indeed she gives the credit to her daughter, that people like going to confession because they prefer speaking ill of themselves to not speaking of themselves at all; the shrewd '*toutes les philosophies ne sont bonnes que quand on n'en a que faire*,' and a hundred humorous touches, such as that of the unlucky individual '*qui abusait de la permission qu'ont les hommes d'être laids*.' But they are hardly numerous enough to carry six or seven large volumes of letters on their shoulders down to posterity. It is not to them that Madame de Sévigné owes her position as the writer of the most famous collection of letters since the *Epistolæ ad Familiares*. Like all the very greatest of her company, even Cicero himself, she lives neither by her wit nor by her wisdom, nor by the interest of the men and women among whom she moved; the secret of her immortality is in herself. We love her for being

what s
self to
of liter
of wor
once b
though
one of
would
person
two fig
'Th
her for
it, that
person
anxiety
of style
necessa
there, i
great
of the v
a few o
among
people
unique
anythin
letters
terity.
letters
to thin
one of
swallow
attitude
time th
written
could h
hers.
ing the
rememb
destined
the unc
the pap
style ha
she spa
too pur
even in
VOL.

what she is, and we read her for her rare gift of showing herself to us. There is, indeed, another thing of which only lovers of literature are conscious. If style consists in such a choice of words and such an ordering of them that they shall be at once beautiful in themselves and in exact harmony with the thought they are to utter, the style of Madame de Sévigné is one of the most perfect in all the world. Without it she would have been unreadable; for, in spite of all the great personages who cross and recross her stage, there are only two figures who are always on it, her daughter and herself.

'That eternal daughter' frightened FitzGerald away from her for years: and indeed who could guess, till he had tried it, that some hundreds of letters addressed to the same person, pouring out the same love, repeating the same anxieties, and describing the same life, could by any magic of style be anything but wearisome? Yet she has it, that necessary magic. And the proof of her greatness lies just there, in the greatness of her task. It is true that in the great modern edition of her letters only two-thirds, perhaps, of the whole number are addressed to her daughter; and that a few of the others—some of those to Bussy, for instance—are among the very best she ever wrote. But history remembers people by their most characteristic achievement, by the unique thing they did, if they were happy enough to do anything unique. And it is as the author of the almost daily letters to her daughter that Madame de Sévigné lives to posterity. Indeed, the daughter is felt everywhere, even in the letters addressed to other people; so that we can hardly stop to think of Madame de Sévigné as what she certainly was, one of the most loyal and affectionate of friends: the less is swallowed up in the greater, and we seem to know her in one attitude alone. She is for us always and only and for all time the most affectionate of mothers. If Cowper had written to Lady Hesketh twice a week for twenty years we could have judged whether his gift was as full and perfect as hers. There is no one else to whom we could think of applying the test. But with her it is only now and then that we remember its severity. Writing to her daughter is the destined business of her life, and she does it with the ease and the unconsciousness of genius. Her pen makes its way over the paper with the smooth certainty of running water; her style has the delightful clearness of the brook; and when she sparkles, her jewels, like the brook's, are too natural and too pure to fear the face of the sun. In fertility of thought, even in fertility of fancy, a thousand writers have surpassed

her, but not one in the plainer fertility of true and simple human speech. No one has ever had more of that gift of happy expression which alone can fitly utter the old things of every day that are so hard to say just because they have to be said so often. She seems to fill her pen at some unfailing fountain of ease and grace and good nature that runs brightly and never runs dry. We all, unless we are very unhappy, have some one, or some one or two, nearest of all near to us, to whom we often want to tell our affection. Some of us cannot get it on the paper plainly enough even for their eyes; who can put it there day after day without some sense of the narrow limits of human speech, some consciousness that only the old words, used before a thousand times, and no others, are there to use again, and that to seek for any that do not come of their own accord would be to profane the spontaneity of love? Madame de Sévigné knows no such difficulty. Twice a week for twenty years she writes to her daughter, beginning or ending always with an outburst of her unique affection, and often making it both her first word and her last.

No one ever wrote so simply; there is not a page, perhaps, in all her volumes, except the brilliant letters about the Lauzun engagement, which shows one trace of the labour of composition. She makes no search after effect; she has very few purple patches. 'Half her beauty,' as FitzGerald said, 'is the liquid melodiousness of her language—all unpremeditated as a blackbird's.' And yet the old story is every time as nearly new as possible. Nothing can exhaust her infinite variety. The unique love, unchanging and unchangeable, finds a thousand ways of utterance, each as simple as spontaneous, as persuasively delightful as the last. Here she is, one Sunday in 1684, at Les Rochers, turning over and over the treasured letters which were all she could have of the daughter whose home was so many hundred miles away. 'Je les lis, et je les relis, j'en fais toute ma joie, toute ma tristesse, toute mon occupation: enfin vous êtes le centre de tout et la cause de tout.' Here she is at Paris, not quite well, and doctoring herself; she is at that Hôtel Carnavalet where we may still go and think of her, and where her daughter had but just left her.

'J'ai été un peu fâchée de ne vous point voir prendre possession de cette chambre dès le matin, me questionner, m'épiloguer, m'examiner, me gouverner, et me secourir à la moindre apparence de vapeur. Ah! ma chère enfant, que tout cela est doux et aimable! que j'ai soupiré tristement de ne plus recevoir ces marques si naturelles de votre amitié! et ce café que vous prenez, et cette

toile
et q
En
pers
vous
insin

she
s'a
her
wh
Fra

sans
sens
est
ma
vos
n'es
tati
n'ai
esp
vif
cho
fère
que
tout
de

clo
kn
Fe
Ch
of
mo
the
Sa
de
bir
son
as
bo
hin
Sh
pr
du

toilette qui arrive : et votre compagnie du matin qui vous cherche et qui vous suit, et contre laquelle mon rideau me sert de cloison. En vérité, ma fille, on perd infiniment quand on vous perd : jamais personne n'a jeté des charmes dans l'amitié, comme vous faites : je vous le dis toujours, vous gâtez le métier : tout est plat, tout est insipide quand on en a goûté.'

Easiest and most contented of mortal women as she was, she, who could say of her own temper, 'elle s'accommode et s'amuse de tout,' and mean it, she could never accommodate herself to the extraordinary caprice of fate, as she called it, which placed her daughter and herself at opposite ends of France.

'J'ai regret à tous mes jours qui s'en vont, et qui m'entraînent sans que j'aie le temps d'être avec vous : je regrette ma vie et je sens pourtant que je la quitterais avec moins de peine, puisque tout est si mal rangé pour me la rendre agréable. Dans ces pensées, ma très chère, on pleure quelquefois sans vous le dire, et je mériterai vos sermons malgré moi, plus souvent que je ne le voudrai ; car ce n'est jamais volontairement que je me trouve dans ces tristes méditations : elles se trouvent tout naturellement dans mon cœur, et je n'ai pas l'esprit de m'en tirer, ma chère fille. Je suis au désespoir de n'avoir pas été maîtresse aujourd'hui d'un sentiment si vif : je n'ai pas accoutumé de m'y abandonner : parlons d'autre chose. C'est un de mes tristes amusements que de penser à la différence de l'année passée et de celle-ci ; quelle compagnie les soirs ! quelle joie de vous voir, et de vous rencontrer et de vous parler à toute heure ! que de retours agréables pour moi ! Rien ne m'échappe de ces heureux jours, que les jours mêmes qui sont échappés.'

This separation from her daughter was really the one cloud in the serenest and sunniest of lives. For the rest she knew little but prosperity and content. She was born on February 5, 1626, the daughter of Celse-Bénigne, Baron de Chantal, thus belonging to one of the most ancient families of France, as her cousin Bussy was well aware. Her father's mother, under the influence of St. François de Sales, became the Foundress of a religious order, that of the Visitation de Sainte Marie. Her own mother was the daughter of Philippe de Coulanges, a man of character and fortune, but not of high birth ; and it was by him and his wife, and afterwards by their son, the Abbé de Coulanges, that she was chiefly brought up, as she early lost her parents. Her uncle the Abbé, the *bien bon* of her letters, lived with her till his death, and it was to him that she owed her beloved *Livri*, of which he was Abbot. She was married, in 1644, to the Marquis de Sévigné, who proved in no way worthy of his wife, and was killed in a duel in 1652, leaving his widow with a son and a daughter.

From thenceforth her life was devoted to her children and her friends, above all to the daughter, who was her supreme interest and occupation. The son, who seems to have been a man of much charm and humour, settled down on his property after a somewhat stormy youth, married quietly, lived quietly, died in religious retreat at Paris, and left no children. The daughter, the great beauty of her day, married the Comte de Grignan in 1669; and, after the birth of her eldest daughter, in 1670, followed him to Provence, where he held the office of Lieutenant-General of Languedoc. It is to her southern exile that we owe the letters of Madame de Sévigné. Mother and daughter saw each other for a month or two every few years, at Paris or Grignan, or elsewhere; but that was all. And they were happiest, little as Madame de Sévigné would admit it—the affection was really at its strongest when it could only express itself by letters: for their temperaments were too unlike to make actual companionship run easily for them. For the rest, Madame de Sévigné's life was chiefly spent either at Paris, in various houses, and finally in the Hôtel Carnavalet, or at Les Rochers, the Sévigné place in Brittany, or at her uncle's abbey of Livri. She died at Grignan, of small-pox, on April 17, 1696. Her daughter survived her till 1705, dying of the same complaint. Madame de Grignan's only son died before his mother, and the only grandchild of Madame de Sévigné who left issue was Pauline Grignan, who married M. de Simiane, her father's successor in Languedoc. She it was who first authorized the publication of her grandmother's letters, at the same time destroying her mother's. From this marriage there are still numerous descendants.

It is a tranquil, easy, unruffled life, no doubt; but it was no mere 'health and wealth' that made it so happy. The truth is, that no one ever had more than Madame de Sévigné of the temperament that makes for happiness. She loved books, she loved nature, she loved her friends, when she could have them, and her solitude when she could not. Such tastes are an armour of content against which fate's slings and arrows beat themselves in vain. He who will be happy let him receive it from himself, said the wise Stoic; and no one ever practised his precept better than Marie, Marquise de Sévigné. A day by herself at Livri or Les Rochers had no terrors at all for her. She would take her solitary rambles under her beloved trees, she would sit in the arbours she had placed among them, with the mottoes on them, such as you may still see in old gardens, 'Bella cosa

far niente' on one side, and 'Amor odit inertes' on the other. She would have two or three books with her to fit all moods, Nicole's *Moral Essays*, a history of the Valois Kings, Tasso or Josephus, Molière or Rabelais. She would listen to the songs of the birds and sing them her own in answer till late at night in her earlier days, and afterwards till the dew, once, as she says, 'the oldest of all her friends,' but now forbidden under the ban of doctors and daughters, came to drive her in to her fireside or her writing table. 'Il y a quelque chose de fou,' as she herself says, 'à chanter toute seule dans un bois'; but it is a kind of folly known only to the happy. Great lady as she was, she knew better than to lose her life in following any of the wills-o'-the-wisp whose pursuit is the daily disappointment of so many of her kind. She set her affections on sound and simple things, attainable, most of them, by all the world, all of them by everyone who has a moderate competence of fortune. Saint she was not, no doubt, and still less sinner, if we judge her by human standards; rather her philosophy and her religion were of the plain sort, that fits common days better than crises, and breeds saints or heroes less than sensible men and women.

'Vivre avec les vivants,' in her own phrase, was her plan for herself, as well as her advice to her daughter; to live and let live, yes, and also to make live where she could: for herself no premature surrender to old age and forgetfulness; for others, not of her own kind, no intolerance, no impertinence of intrusion or admonition; and for her own no stinted measure of affection, stimulus, and help. 'Je crois, en vérité,' she most justly claims, 'que personne n'a plus de facilité que moi dans le commerce de la vie civile.' When her friends the De Chaulnes are on bad terms with another friend, Madame de Marbœuf, she pays no heed to it, stays with the one party and dines with the other. 'J'irai toujours mon chemin: je ne suis mal avec personne,' she says, and she ends by smoothing the quarrel away. No one was ever freer from that suspicious sensitiveness which is the silliest of all causes for unhappiness in the world. She knew the Duc de Chaulnes was a genuine friend, and in the face of all appearances she alone refused to believe he had not done what he could for her son; and it was her faith and not her daughter's unfaith that proved right in the end. 'Point d'ennemis, ma chère enfant,' she writes: 'faites-vous une maxime de cette pensée, qui est aussi chrétienne que politique; je dis non seulement *point d'ennemis*, mais *beaucoup d'amis*.' The pride of youth, as she says in another place, is

apt to fancy that it can cut its way through life with the sword of its own strength: but the wisdom of middle age discovers that it needs support on every side. 'On trouve qu'on a besoin de tout le monde.' That was her practice as well as her theory. She took men and things, talents and pleasures, as the day brought them, and set herself to make the best of them. When she saw people did not like her she had a rule of going on her way and troubling no more about them; and we are not surprised to hear that the system worked out, as she says, 'le plus heureusement du monde.' On the other hand, when things or people she liked were within reach she would not let the good chance go by. 'On n'a pas des plaisirs à choisir; quand il s'en trouve quelqu'un d'innocent et de naturel sous notre main, il me semble qu'il ne faut point se faire la cruauté de s'en priver.' But for her religion she would have been wholly of the Horatian turn of mind: none of the texts and tags she set up at Les Rochers could have a nearer fitness for her than many a line she might have taken from the Roman poet.

'Dona præsentis cape lætus horæ, et
Linque severa,

and the rest, are just the mottoes to come from her mouth: and, indeed, they are the embodiment of what will always be a large part of the wisdom of life, so long as it remembers that it is not the whole. It was a large part with her, too large, it may be, but it was never the whole.

The true pleasure-seeker, indeed, would find reason enough to scorn her company in the mere list of books she read. She had an insatiable love of reading, and she ranked the habit high enough among the sources of human happiness to satisfy Macaulay or Gibbon. But for the man of pleasure her choice of books would have been intolerable. The things she read most of all, and talked most about, were works of devotion. She lived in a time which, in spite of two immoral Courts, was, both in France and England, the classical age of devotional literature. Perhaps it was even the classical age of the devotional life as lived in high places. Certainly it was a happy interval placed between the controversial brutality of the preceding period and the otiose rationalism which followed. It is possible that the great world, whether of society or of intellect, has never been so actively interested in the history, the faith, and the practice of Christianity as it was in the half-century before the deaths of Louis XIV. and Queen Anne. The Churches of

Fra
pres
crow
cho
tion
mos
Her
reli
dou
own
An
the
was
the
She
the
say
gen
wit
tha
sid
reli
Pe
the
Mo
lett

ent
de
tou
les
vu
lu,
je
qu
me
dis
plu
air
qu
pe
qu

T
w
in

France and England abounded in great divines, great preachers, and even in great saints; and men of the world crowded to hear them, delighted in their books, and often chose to spend their last years in retirement and meditation on what they had been taught. It was into the innermost circle of this society that Madame de Sévigné was born. Her grandmother was, as we have seen, the foundress of a religious order, and was afterwards to be canonized. She was doubly connected with Port Royal, both by relations of her own and through her husband's uncle, who lived and died there. And, woman of the world as she was to her finger tips, the mark of Port Royal was on her ineffaceably. Pascal was, of course, altogether beyond her, both the mind and the soul of him; she admired and revered, but that was all. She was quite conscious that the depths and heights of theology and philosophy were not for her, and was wont to say that, after all, both mystics and metaphysicians were generally forced at last to wave aside inconvenient questions with an *altitudo*. Her mind was, indeed, of just the kind that doubts the value of such speculations. It was on the side of manners and practice that Port Royal, and, indeed, religion itself, attracted her, and so it was neither the *Pensées* nor even the *Provincial Letters*, 'divine' as she thought them, not Pascal at all, but Nicole, the author of the *Moral Essays*, who was her favourite reading. Letter after letter shows how constantly his book was in her hands.

'Vous savez,' she writes in 1671, 'que je suis toujours un peu entêtée de mes lectures. Ceux à qui je parle ont intérêt que je lise de bons livres. Celui dont je veux parler présentement c'est toujours de Nicole, et c'est du traité *d'entretenir la paix entre les hommes*. Ma bonne, j'en suis charmée: je n'ai jamais rien vu de plus utile ni si plein d'esprit et de lumière. Si vous ne l'avez pas lu, lisez-le: et si vous l'avez lu, relisez-le avec une nouvelle attention: je crois que tout le monde s'y trouve; pour moi, je suis persuadée qu'il a été fait à mon intention; j'espère aussi d'en profiter, j'y ferai mes efforts. Vous savez que je ne puis souffrir que les vieilles gens disent, "Je suis trop vieux pour me corriger": je pardonnerais plutôt à une jeune personne de tenir ce discours. La jeunesse est si aimable qu'il faudrait l'adorer, si l'âme et l'esprit étaient aussi parfaits que le corps: mais quand on n'est plus jeune, c'est alors qu'il faut se perfectionner, et tâcher de regagner du côté des bonnes qualités ce qu'on perd du côté des agréables.'

That is her ordinary tone, not that of a saint, but of a woman of sense, moral sense among the rest. She has indeed more spiritual moments; when she reads the Port

Royal treatise on 'continuing instant in prayer' she will break out in language that almost recalls the *Imitation* :

'On est bien aise de voir qu'il y ait eu, et qu'il y ait encore, des gens à qui Dieu communique son Saint-Esprit et sa grâce avec une telle abondance ; mais, mon Dieu ! quand en aurons-nous quelqu'étincelle, quelque degré ? Quelle tristesse de s'en trouver si loin, et si près d'autre chose ! Ah, fi ! Ne parlons point de ce malheur ; il en faut soupirer et gémir et s'en humilier cent fois par jour !'

But that is only now and then. She is commonly on a lower plane. When one of her friends is much occupied with the desire to save his soul she is very glad to hear that he is absolutely bent on paying his debts, which she declares is the first step towards salvation for people who know what religion really is. For her both faith and duty must be plain things. She has the true intellectual contempt for superstition of all sorts, and, though no heretic, is much more careful to be a Christian than to be a Catholic. She will cut out prayers to the Virgin from her own devotions in order to substitute prayers of St. Augustine, or the *Miserere*, and, though she does not deny the invocation of saints, the inscription she places over the altar at Les Rochers is 'Soli Deo Honor et Gloria.' She hears with horror of a young girl being taught to communicate twice a week, exclaiming, 'Bon Dieu, quelle profanation !' and she more than once asks her daughter whether she thinks herself more saintly than St. Louis, who communicated only three times in the year. For herself, she said she was

'une petite dévote qui ne vaut guères : voilà ce que je suis toujours et pas davantage, à mon grand regret. Oh ! tout ce que j'ai de bon, c'est que je sais bien ma religion, et de quoi il est question : je ne prendrai point le faux pour le vrai : je sais ce qui est bon et ce qui n'en a que l'apparence : j'espère ne m'y point méprendre et que Dieu m'ayant déjà donné de bons sentiments, il m'en donnera encore : les grâces passées me garantissent en quelque sorte celles qui viendront, en sorte que je vis dans la confiance, mêlée pourtant de beaucoup de crainte.'

This is in her later years, but it is substantially the same attitude, more gravely and more reverently put, as that famous one of twenty-five years before :

'Une de mes grandes envies, c'est d'être dévote. Je ne suis ni à Dieu ni au diable ; cet état m'ennuie, quoiqu'entre nous je le trouve le plus naturel du monde. On n'est point au diable parce qu'on craint Dieu, et qu'au fond on a un principe de religion : on n'est point à Dieu aussi, parce que sa loi est dure, et qu'on n'aime

point
nombr
Cepes

So l
great
pani
Not
show

and
not
faith

beca
but,
in a

a me
the
by t

we
gift
won

we a
style
savo

fact
And
who

of c
the
seco

bell
half
tast

orig
sion
Plu

and
of I
she

ce c
at
Cor

was
d'ai
her

point à se détruire soi-même : cela compose les tièdes dont le grand nombre ne m'inquiète point du tout : j'entre dans leurs raisons. Cependant Dieu les hait : il faut donc en sortir, et voilà la difficulté.'

So long as veracity remains a great moral, and lucidity a great mental, quality, this passage and its more famous companion will be among the classics of religious confession. Not a word in it but was meant and acted upon : the letters show that as years went on her religion was always more and more in her mind ; and when death came she met it not only with courage and with submission, but also with faith.

This part of her personality was worth dwelling on, because it was both sincere and characteristic of her day ; but, though more religious books were read at Les Rochers in a month than are read in ten years, it is to be feared, at a modern country house, no one will pretend that religion is the first thought, or anything like the first thought, suggested by the name of Madame de Sévigné. It is not her goodness we think of, but her delightfulness. She has that strange gift of charm which wins a place in our hearts not always won by all the virtues in a row. She is so much cleverer than we are, and yet so humanly like us. Her very style is our style ; it is just as she says of the Port Royalists : ' Nous savons tous les mots dont ils se servent '—they are our own, in fact—' mais jamais nous ne les avons vus si bien placés.' And she loves books as we love them to-day, the few of us who love them at all, not as missiles to throw at the heads of our enemies in Church or State, but as delightful things, the fine flower of human life in their own day, and often the seed of what it is to be after them. 'Ce qui s'appelle les belles lettres,' as she says, was her special reading, and the half-apologetic turn of the phrase marks the newness of the taste. Besides French she reads Latin and Italian in the original, and Greek in translations ; her letters contain allusions to Homer, to Plato and Aristotle, to Epictetus and Plutarch, and frequently to Lucian and Josephus. Tacitus and Virgil were among the Latin authors she had read, and, of Italians, her letters are full of Ariosto and Tasso. In French she went as far back as Rabelais, whose law of liberty, 'Fais ce que voudras,' she was fond of quoting ; she quotes Marot at least once, and of the men of her own day she knew Corneille and Molière and La Fontaine almost by heart, and was no stranger to Racine and Boileau. 'Qu'on est heureux d'aimer à lire,' she bursts out again and again. She tells her grandson, as other people have told other young soldiers

many times since, that there is something 'monstrous' in not employing some of the ample leisure of a barracks in looking into the art of war and its history; she will have all about her get the taste for books, 'la jolie, l'heureuse disposition,' as she calls it, and wisely adds that with it 'on est dessus de l'ennui et de l'oisiveté, deux vilaines bêtes.' She herself ranged over a wide country, almost from pole to pole of the printed world. She loved Cervantes, but she also loved to the last the faded novels of her youth; she was for ever reading religious books, as we have seen, but that did not prevent her from enjoying the *Contes* of La Fontaine; she was not above liking a consignment of Court gossip, and yet she will take Virgil in her carriage on a journey. And indeed the balance leans to the great books. She rejoices in the bad memory which makes her delight in Tasso or Montaigne or Molière at the fifth or sixth time of reading. Few people much given to reading have ever read so little trash. And she is so much more than a well read woman. Who, if not she, is that fine feminine flower of civilization which every old society aspires to rear? It is true that she has but little of the penetrating odour of sympathy for those outside the walled garden of her own life, without which we cannot to-day count any personal civilization complete. But that was a rare product requiring originality in her day; and originality is not her strength; and she has so many other things about her that are pleasant to look on. Who but La Fontaine loved nature then as she did? Who spoke of walking in the evening as she did at Livri, 'délicieusement avec la lune'? Who found their woodland paths as she found hers at Les Rochers, 'd'une beauté, d'une tranquillité, d'une paix, d'un silence à quoi je ne puis m'accoutumer'? Who had such praise as she for the spring, which seemed to her 'd'une jeunesse et d'une douceur' that it made her long more than usually for her daughter? Those are such words as only Nature's true lovers find. And the birds too: she flies from the noise of Paris to catch their first notes. 'On entend déjà les fauvettes, les mésanges, les roitelets, et un petit commencement de bruit et d'air du printemps'; what an excellent phrase, again, made with the eye, or rather the ear, on the thing itself! They also take her to her daughter, as all does that touches her: 'il fait un temps délicieux: tous les oiseaux sont en campagne; je me promène et je relis vos lettres avec une extrême tendresse.'

This is to take her bit by bit, as it were; but think of all in one piece, and what a charming whole it makes. And how

it is
link:
on s
disa
que
perf
the
vent
stra
and
a s
moo
be,
qu'i
vieu
caus
très
bor
her
spac
frien
who
war
love
all t
laug
wer
awa
am
on
so;
thin
kno
soci
she
with
lett
à ce
ther
the
with
as i
and
tow
not

it is all made one by her humour, pleasantest of all known links for holding a personality together. With her it plays on all subjects, from the highest to the lowest. 'Mon père disait qu'il aimait Dieu quand il était bien aise : il me semble que je suis sa fille'; and yet her desire to be devout was perfectly genuine. We have heard her views of debts and the duty of paying them; and yet 'on se ruine quand on veut s'acquitter de tous les devoirs de la vie.' She was no stranger, quite the reverse, to grave thoughts about death and about her sins, and she had no lack of appreciation of a saintly retirement; but she was not always in a grave mood, and when she was not her comment on a death will be, 'En vérité la mort se mêle si inconsidérément partout qu'il ne faut compter sur rien'; she will cry out, 'Que les vieux péchés sont désagréables!' she will drily explain the causes of a 'retreat' as 'quelques intérêts de famille et une très désagréable humeur,' and its result as mere yawns and boredom. Little things like these do not give her mind or her literary gift as the whole letters, for which we have no space, would give them; but they show her to us as her friends saw her. They must have thought of her as a woman who joined an innocently witty tongue to an unfailingly warm and loyal heart; one who laughed as often as she loved, and that was always; loved her own and laughed at all the rest; found her country neighbours more amusing to laugh at than to meet; always asserted that stupid visitors were the best of all, because of the ecstasy of their going away; generally lived her life and went her way, amused and amusing, a dispenser and receiver of good things of all sorts on every side. They were right to see her so, for she was so; but she was other things besides, and perhaps we shall think of her even more affectionately—where they could not know her so well—in the solitude she loved before all society but that of one being in the world, in her woods as she describes herself, all alone with God and with herself, with the thought of her daughter, with her daughter's last letter, and a book. 'Il y a quelque chose de doux et d'aimable à cette solitude, à ce profond silence, à cette liberté'; and it is there, perhaps, that she touches us most of all. It is with the country, not the town, that we specially associate her; with country life, not of course as the peasant knows it, but as it is lived in country houses. And is it often lived fuller and better than she lived it? At least, when we fly from town to country, let us bear her and her doings in mind, and not think that of all the ways in which she spends her time

with her dear Duchess at Brévanes the only one in which she is to be imitated is the last. 'On se promène, on lit, on est seule, on prie Dieu, on se retrouve, on fait bonne chère.' The delights of good talk she thinks unnecessary to mention, we may suppose, for her daughter needed no telling that where she was they were not far away; but with that indispensable addition what better motto can there be to set over the door of a country house in her day, in our day, in any day?

ART. VI.—THE HOLY EUCHARIST: AN
HISTORICAL INQUIRY.

PART II.

To the list of books prefixed to Part I. add the following:

29. *A Compendium of Ecclesiastical History.* By Dr. JOHN C. L. GIESELER. Translated from the German. (Edinburgh, 1846-1855.)
30. *Praelectiones Dogmaticæ de Verbo Incarnato* quas in C. R. Universitate Cenipontana habuit F. A. STENTRUP. (Ceniponte, 1882-1889.)

IN his valuable paper on the history of opinion about the Sacrifice of the Mass in the Latin Church, Dr. Vacant has referred to St. Gregory the Great as beginning the transition from the thought of the patristic period to that of the Middle Ages.¹ And in the writings of St. Gregory, while the ideas we have traced through the patristic period in the first part of this article still remain, there is not only a new emphasis on the definite and immediate effect of the offering of the sacrifice of the Eucharist, but also a stronger way of speaking of the commemoration of the Passion of Christ.

VII. It is appropriate, then, that we should begin this second part of our inquiry by setting out the teaching of St. Gregory the Great. In his writings we find unquestioning belief that the gift in the Eucharist is that of the Body and Blood of Christ; an absence of definition in what way the elements convey this sacred food; and an assertion of the Eucharistic sacrifice which, without exactly defining wherein

¹ Vacant, *Histoire de la conception du Sacrifice de la Messe dans l'Eglise Latine*, p. 25.

the s
it wi
Lord
Thus
which
been
Euch
has li
none
duty

'offer
Flesh
from
the de
dead
Him,
(iteru
oblati
the sa
hands
this, t
is, wh
(imita
faithfu
the vo
Jesus
broug
joined
that a

I
sents

'I
says,
His o
the s
Passio

And
which
the e
Euch

'I
out in
who v

the sacrifice consists, ascribes to it particular effects, connects it with both the Passion and the heavenly offering of our Lord, and sees in it in some sense a renewal of the Passion. Thus, in the *Dialogues*, after mentioning two instances in which deliverance from captivity and impending death had been obtained through particular offerings of the Holy Eucharist with specific aims, and observing that this sacrifice has like efficacy for the dead as for the living, and exhorting, none the less, to good use of the present life, he declares the duty of

'offering to God daily oblations of tears, the daily sacrifices of His Flesh and Blood. For this victim in a unique way saves the soul from eternal destruction, which in mystery renews (reparat) for us the death of the only-begotten Son, who, though He rising from the dead dieth no more, and death shall not again have dominion over Him, yet living in Himself immortally and incorruptibly is again (iterum) sacrificed on our behalf in this mystery of the sacred oblation. For there His Body is taken, His Flesh is distributed for the salvation of the people, His Blood is poured, not now into the hands of unbelievers, but into the mouths of the faithful. From this, therefore, let us think of what kind this sacrifice on our behalf is, which to set us free (pro absolutione nostra) ever represents (imitatur) the Passion of the only-begotten Son. For who of the faithful can hold it doubtful that in the very hour of the sacrifice at the voice of the priest the heavens are opened, in that mystery of Jesus Christ the bands of the angels are present, things lowest are brought into communion with (sociari) things highest, things earthly joined with things heavenly (terrena caelestibus jungi), and the things that are seen and those which are unseen become one?'¹

In his *Homilies on the Gospels* St. Gregory similarly represents the Eucharistic sacrifice as a renewal of the Passion.

'He who in Himself rising from the dead dieth no more,' he says, 'still by means of this sacrifice suffers again (iterum patitur) in His own mystery on our behalf. For as often as we offer to Him the sacrifice of His Passion, so often we renew (reparamus) His Passion to ourselves, to set us free (ad absolutionem nostram).'²

And in his treatise on the Book of Job he refers to the sacrifice which our Lord abidingly offers in heaven, and thus supplies the explanation of the statement already quoted that in the Eucharist earth and heaven are joined together.

'Everyday,' he says, 'Job ceases not to offer sacrifice, because without intermission the Redeemer offers a burnt-offering on our behalf, who without ceasing presents (demonstrat) to the Father His incarna-

¹ St. Gregory the Great, *Dial.* iv. 57, 58.

² *Idem*, *In Ev. Hom.* II. xxxvii. 7.

tion for us. For His incarnation is itself the offering of our cleansing, and, when He shows Himself as man, He washes away by His intervention the sins of man. And by the mystery of His humanity He offers a perpetual sacrifice, because these things also which He cleanses are eternal.¹

VIII. As regards the doctrine of the Eucharistic sacrifice, the theology of the Middle Ages did little more than reproduce the thought of the Fathers. Indeed, in some respects, the mediæval teaching was less full than the patristic. In the system of Christian doctrine drawn up by St. John of Damascus in the eighth century—a system which, while it aimed at summarizing the earlier Greek teaching, was subsequently influential in the West as well as in the East—he was content, in addition to quoting our Lord's words at the institution in a form which describes the Eucharist as the proclamation of the death of the Son of Man and the confession of His resurrection,² with the following brief reference to the sacrifice:

'With bread and wine did Melchizedek, the priest of the Most High God, receive Abraham as he was returning from the defeat of the strangers. That table prefigured this mystic table, as that priest was the type and figure of Christ the true high priest. For, says Scripture, "Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek." Of this bread the shewbread was a figure. This is the pure sacrifice, that is the bloodless sacrifice which the Lord through the prophet said should be offered from the rising of the sun unto its setting.'³

The great treatises on dogma written in the twelfth century by Peter Lombard and in the thirteenth century by St. Thomas Aquinas, contain statements about the Eucharistic sacrifice a little longer than that of St. John of Damascus, but still brief and without entering into details, and in striking contrast to the wealth of discussion with which St. Thomas Aquinas in particular surrounds most of the subjects with which he deals. In the *Sentences* Peter Lombard writes:

'It is next inquired whether that which the priest does is properly called a sacrifice or offering, and whether Christ is daily offered or has been offered once only. To this it can be said shortly that what

¹ St. Gregory the Great, *Mor.* i. 32.

² St. John of Damascus, *De Fid. orth.* iv. 13: 'As often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye proclaim the death of the Son of Man and confess His resurrection, until He come.' (Quoted from the *Liturgy of St. James.*)

³ *Ibid.*

is pres
an obl
(repræ
on the
was H
becaus
of that
done c
been c
in ano

In
slight
In ad
called
of the
'mem
he say

'In
offerin
to Sir
names
on a p
Now t
kind o
the P
therefo
Christ
made
not we
(reco
this Sa
effect
we are
Where
as the
redem
far as
Christ
also it
life of
world.
this Sa

TI
Peter

cleansing,
by His
humanity
which He

charistic
le more
in some
than the
n up by
n which,
ing, was
e East—
words at
st as the
onfession
ce to the

the Most
defeat of
that priest
For, says
of Melchi-
this is the
d through
sun unto

e twelfth
century
about the
John of
o details,
ion with
s most of
ces Peter

is properly
ffered or
y that what

ye eat this
of Man and
Liturgy of

is presented and consecrated by the priest is called a sacrifice and an oblation, because it is the memorial (*memoria*) and representation (*representatio*) of the true sacrifice and holy offering which was made on the altar of the cross. On the cross Christ died once, and there was He offered in Himself; in the Sacrament He is offered daily, because in the Sacrament there is the commemoration (*recordatio*) of that which was done once. . . . Hence it is gathered that what is done on the altar is and is called a sacrifice; and that Christ has been offered once and is offered daily, but in one way at that time, in another way now.¹

In the *Summa Theologica* St. Thomas Aquinas writes at slightly greater length on this subject than Peter Lombard. In addition to brief passing statements that the Eucharist 'is called a sacrifice' because it is 'commemorative of the Passion of the Lord which was a true sacrifice,'² and that it is the 'memorial' and the 'representation' of 'the Passion of Christ,'³ he says:

'In a twofold way the celebration of this Sacrament is called the offering of Christ. It is so called firstly because, as Augustine says to Simplicianus, "symbols (*imagines*) are usually called by the names of those things of which they are symbols, as when looking on a picture or wall-painting we say, This is Cicero, This is Sallust." Now the celebration of this Sacrament, as has been said before, is a kind of representative symbol (*imago quædam representativa*) of the Passion of Christ, which is the true offering of Him. And therefore the celebration of this Sacrament is called the offering of Christ. Because of this Ambrose says, "In Christ the offering was made once, powerful for eternal salvation. What, then, of us? Do not we offer sacrifice every day? Yes, but for the commemoration (*recordationem*) of His death." In another way the celebration of this Sacrament is called the offering of Christ so far as concerns the effect of the Passion of Christ, because by means of this Sacrament we are made partakers of the fruit of the Passion of the Lord. Wherefore in a certain Secret Prayer for Sunday it is said, "As often as the commemoration of this sacrifice is made, the work of our redemption is carried on (*opus nostræ redemptionis exercetur*)." So far as concerns the first method, then, it could have been said that Christ was offered even in the figures of the Old Testament. Whence also it is said, "Whose names have not been written in the book of life of the Lamb, who has been slain from the foundation of the world." But so far as concerns the second method, it is peculiar to this Sacrament that in the celebration of it Christ is offered.'⁴

These three representative writers, St. John of Damascus, Peter Lombard, and St. Thomas Aquinas, then, carry on the

¹ Peter Lombard, *Sent.* IV. xii. 7.

² St. Thomas Aquinas, *S.T.* III. lxxiii. 4.

³ *Ibid.* III. lxxiv. 1, lxxix. 1.

⁴ *Ibid.* III. lxxxiii. 1.

patristic teaching that the Eucharist is a sacrifice; and two of them, Peter Lombard and St. Thomas, describe this sacrifice as commemorative of the Passion of Christ. No one of the three mentions the connexion, found in St. Gregory the Great and some of the earlier Fathers, between the Eucharist and the heavenly offering of our Lord. This aspect of the Eucharistic sacrifice is found, however, in other writers of the Middle Ages. In the ninth century Paschasius Radbert represents the significance of the Eucharistic sacrifice as consisting in the fact that the oblation of the Church on earth is united with the offering which our Lord makes in heaven, whereby He exercises His eternal priesthood after the order of Melchizedek, and closely associates the reception of His Body and Blood with entering into His heavenly action.¹ Odo of Cambrai,² Ivo of Chartres,³ Hildebert of Tours,⁴ and Algerus of Liège⁵ in the twelfth century, and other writers of the Middle Ages, make similar references to the connexion of the Eucharistic sacrifice with the heavenly offering of Christ. To quote one instance, Algerus writes:

'The priest, consecrating the Body of the Lord on the earthly altar as the minister of Christ (vice Christi), and yet not assigning anything to his own merits, but all to the power and grace of God, prays in the canon to God the Father saying, "Command that these oblations be carried to Thee by the hands and power of Thy Son, Thy Angel, who is the Angel of Great Counsel, not to this Thy lowly and visible altar, where now He is, but to Thy altar on high, that is Thy Son, whom Thou hast exalted to Thy right hand, in the presence of Thy majesty, that there may be to us the Body and Blood of Thy beloved Son,"⁶ showing that the Son Himself, by the command of the Father, is in Heaven offering sacrifice, and is that on which it is offered, because we lean altogether on His faith and grace that the earthly bodies are converted into Christ; and we believe that He, sitting in the heavenly places at the right hand of the Father, intercedes for us, and is consecrated and is in the Sacrament of the altar.'⁷

¹ Paschasius Radbert, *De Corp. et Sang. Dom.* 8, 12.

² Odo of Cambrai, *Expos. Can. Missae*, 3.

³ Ivo of Chartres, *Opusc. de Conv. vet. et nov. Sacri.*

⁴ Hildebert of Tours, *De Myst. Missae*.

⁵ Algerus of Liège, *De Sacram. Corp. et Sang. Dom.* i. 14.

⁶ Algerus here adds his own glosses to the words of the Mass.

⁷ *Ibid.* For a number of references and some quotations illustrating this aspect of the Eucharistic sacrifice in the mediæval writers, see Thalhofer, *Handbuch der Katholischen Liturgik*, I. i. 228, 229. For a hostile criticism of Thalhofer's references, marked, however, by much special pleading, see Stentrup, *De Verbo Incarnato, Soteriologia*, ii. 320-333.

A
Ages
of th
nition
sacri
is of
Unde
conv
and
rende
maje
the C
Deat
the s
writ
Man
the p
aspec
is no
Euch
sacri
the c
elem
ally c
in hea
as Hi
Eucha
the m
the C
was th
least
the li
gethe
Himse
IX
their
theory
lessen
greatl
the P
wine.

¹ E
quoted
is on p
on the
VOL

As in the Fathers, so in the theologians of the Middle Ages, there is no fully developed and accurately defined theory of the Eucharistic sacrifice, and this absence of specific definitions is found together with belief that the Eucharist is a sacrifice, that it is commemorative of the Passion, and that it is offered in union with the heavenly offering of Christ. Underlying the statements of this belief was the evident conviction that there is one abiding sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Christ, offered on the cross in the life surrendered unto death, presented in His risen and ascended majesty by our Lord in heaven, and pleaded at the altar by the Church on earth in union both with the Passion and Death of our Lord and with His heavenly offering. Being the sacrifice of Christ Himself, in which, to use the phrase of a writer of the twelfth century, Euthymius Zigabenus, 'His Manhood itself beseeches the Father on our behalf';¹ it is the presentation not of one aspect only, but of the many aspects of the life of our Lord. From this point of view there is no inconsistency when Peter Lombard describes the Eucharist as 'the memorial and representation of the true sacrifice and holy offering which was made on the altar of the cross,' and Paschasius Radbert speaks of the earthly elements which the Church offers being invisibly and spiritually carried on high and united with the sacrifice of our Lord in heaven, and then given back to us by the heavenly Priest as His Body and His Blood. To one writer the aspect of the Eucharist in which it is a commemoration of the Passion was the more prominent; to another the aspect whereby it unites the Church on earth with the ministering of Christ in heaven was the most valued; possibly, at times, the aspect which was least prominent or least valued was almost or quite forgotten; the link by which all the different statements are bound together is the conception of the one abiding Sacrifice of Christ Himself.

IX. If it is a matter of surprise that the schoolmen, with their love of elaborate system, did not work out an explicit theory of the Eucharistic sacrifice, the surprise may perhaps be lessened when it is remembered that their attention was greatly occupied by questions arising out of the relation of the Presence of our Lord in the Eucharist to the bread and wine. It has already been noticed that in the teaching of St.

¹ Euthymius Zigabenus, *In Heb.* (vii. 25). The above sentence is quoted by Bishop Westcott in his *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, p. 192. It is on p. 392 of vol. ii. of the edition of the commentaries of Euthymius on the Epistles published at Athens in 1887.

Gregory the Great the belief that the Eucharistic gift is the Body and Blood of Christ is not accompanied by any definitions as to the way in which this gift is conveyed by the elements. Passing from the end of the patristic period to the beginning of the Middle Ages, St. John of Damascus affirms, like the Fathers, that the bread and wine are the Body and Blood of Christ; uses, like some of them, the word 'become' in the assertion that the elements are the vehicles of the sacred Presence; and follows the Liturgies in ascribing the work of consecration to God the Holy Ghost. The most important passage on this subject in his writings is that in the fourth book of the treatise *On the Orthodox Faith*. He there says:

'If then the word of God is living and active, and the Lord hath done all things whatsoever He hath willed; if He said, "Let the light come to be," and it came to be, "Let the firmament come to be," and it came to be; if by the word of the Lord the heavens were established and all the power of them by the breath of His mouth; if the heaven and the earth, fire and water and air, and all that pertains to them, were made complete by the word of the Lord, and moreover man, the most famous of living things; if God the Word Himself by the exercise of His will (*θελήσας*) became man, and the pure and unspotted blood of the holy ever-virgin supplied to Him flesh without generation by man (*ἀσπύρως*)—cannot He make bread His own Body and the wine and the water Blood? . . . God said, "This is My Body," and "This is My Blood," and "Do this for a memorial of Me," and by His almighty command it comes to be until He come. . . . For, as all things whatsoever that God did, He did by the operation (*ἐνεργεία*) of the Holy Ghost, so also now the operation of the Holy Ghost performs (*ἐργάζεται*) the things which are beyond nature (*τὰ ὑπὲρ φύσιν*), which faith alone can grasp (*ἃ οὐ δύναται χωρῆσαι εἰ μὴ μόνῃ ἡ πίστις*). "How shall this be to me," says the holy Virgin, "seeing I know not a man?" The Archangel Gabriel answers, "The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Most High shall overshadow thee." And now thou askest, How does the bread become the Body of Christ, and the wine and the water the Blood of Christ? I also say to thee, The Holy Ghost comes upon them (*ἐπιφοιτᾷ*) and makes them those things which are beyond reason and thought (*ταῦτα ποιεῖ τὰ ὑπὲρ λόγον καὶ ἔννοιαν*). . . . The bread itself and the wine are transmuted (*μεταποιούνται*: al. *μεταποιέται*) into the Body and Blood of God. But if you inquire as to the method, how this comes to be, it is enough for you to hear that it is by means of the Holy Ghost, as also from the holy Mother of God by means of the Holy Ghost the Lord took to Himself flesh to be His own. And we know no more than that the word of God is true and active and almighty, while the method is inscrutable (*ὃ δὲ τρόπος ἀνεξερεύνητος*). . . . The bread that is offered (*ὃ τῆς προθέσεως ἄρτος*) and the wine and water are by means of the invocation and descent of the Holy Ghost

sup
dylo
of C
The
Bloo
fille
Him
but-
brea
head
natu
that
two.
figur
Basil
the c

more
wine
lines
of S
half
Euch
Pasc
Lora
sibili
and
and
auth
at th
line
its fu
wine
had
is an
secre

and c
out o

1
spon
writ
which
it rep

2
3
p. 23

the Body
ions as to
elements.
beginning
like the
Blood of
' in the
the sacred
e work of
important
the fourth
e says:

Lord hath
"Let the
t come to
the heavens
th of His
air, and all
f the Lord,
f God the
came man,
n supplied
cannot He
lood? . . .
" and "Do
nd it comes
at God did,
o also now
the things
e can grasp
this be to
an?" The
upon thee,
And now
Christ, and
say to thee,
them those
ἀπὲρ λόγῳ
transmade
od of God.
to be, it is
y Ghost, as
Holy Ghost
d we know
nd almighty,
νῆτος). . . .
e wine and
Holy Ghost

supernaturally transmade (διὰ τῆς ἐκκλησεως καὶ ἐπιφοιτήσεως τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος ὑπερφύως μεταποιούνται) into the Body and the Blood of Christ, and are not two things, but one and the same thing. . . . The bread and the wine are not a figure (τύπος)¹ of the Body and Blood of Christ (God forbid), but the Body of the Lord itself that is filled with Godhead (αὐτὸ τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Κυρίου τεθεωμένον) of the Lord Himself, who said, 'This is My'—not figure (τύπος) of the body but—"body," and not figure of the blood but "blood." . . . The bread of the communion is not mere bread (λίτος) but united to Godhead (ἡνωμένος θεότητι); and the body united to Godhead is not one nature only, but one nature of the body and another of the Godhead that is united to it, so that both together are not one nature but two. . . . If some have called the bread and the wine the counter-figures (ἀντίτυπα) of the Body and the Blood of the Lord, as holy Basil said, they, in using this word, spoke of the offering not after the consecration, but before the consecration.'²

As time went on, and especially in the West, fuller and more definite explanations of the doctrine that the bread and wine become the Body and Blood of Christ were given on the lines of the passage which we have quoted from the treatise of St. John of Damascus *On the Orthodox Faith*. In the first half of the ninth century 'a landmark in the history of Eucharistic doctrine'³ is to be found in the treatise of Paschasius Radbert entitled *On the Body and Blood of the Lord*. Like St. John of Damascus, Paschasius sees the possibility of the change of the bread and wine into the Body and Blood of Christ in the almighty power of the Creator and the operation of God the Holy Ghost, and finds the authority for belief in this change in the words of our Lord at the institution of the Sacrament. Carrying further the line of thought which St. John of Damascus did not push to its full conclusions, he used the word 'figure' of the bread and wine in such a way as to imply that after consecration they had ceased to possess actual existence, and denied that there is anything else but the Body and Blood of Christ in the consecrated Sacrament. Thus he says:

'Every Catholic rightly believes with his heart unto righteousness and confesses with his mouth unto salvation that God created all things out of nothing, and can never doubt that it is possible for anything

¹ In the phraseology of St. John of Damascus the words corresponding to 'symbol' and 'figure' have ceased to denote, as in earlier writers (see *Church Quarterly Review*, July 1901, p. 358, note 2), that which is what it signifies, and have come to mean that which is not what it represents.

² St. John of Damascus, *De Fid. orth.* iv. 13.

³ Gore, *Dissertations on Subjects connected with the Incarnation* p. 236.

to be made out of anything again. . . . It is therefore evident that nothing can be outside or contrary to the will of God, but all things entirely yield to it. And therefore let no one be disturbed concerning this Body and Blood of Christ that in the mystery there is true flesh and true blood since He who created has so willed; for "He hath done all things whatever He willed in heaven and in earth." And because He has willed it, though remaining in the shape (figura) of bread and wine, these things must be believed to be entirely and nothing else than the Flesh and Blood of Christ after consecration (haec sic esse omnino nihilque aliud quam caro Christi et sanguis post consecrationem credenda sunt), for which reason the Truth Himself said to the disciples, "This is My flesh for the life of the world," and, that I may speak still more wonderfully, to be plainly no other flesh than that which was born of Mary and suffered on the cross and rose from the tomb. . . . God is the Truth, and, if God is the Truth, whatever Christ has promised in this mystery is true. . . . He who created all things by His word works by His word together with the Holy Ghost; and therefore there must be no doubt where the Trinity is rightly believed to be the artificer. . . . The Body and Blood of Christ are through the power of the Holy Ghost by His word made out of the substance of the bread and wine (ex panis vinique substantia efficitur).¹

This explicit teaching did not escape challenge. The identification of the unseen reality in the Eucharist with the body and blood which were born from the Virgin Mary and suffered on the cross and rose from the tomb was explicitly rejected by Rabanus Maurus,² the Archbishop of Mentz, some ten years after the publication of the book of Paschasius, and by Ratramn,³ a monk of the abbey of Corbey, of which Paschasius was abbot, though on other points the teaching of both these writers is so obscure and apparently contradictory as to leave it doubtful what their positive doctrine was.⁴

In the eleventh century the controversy was revived. Berengar, the Directory of the Cathedral School at Tours, who was appointed Archdeacon of Angers about 1040 A.D., was a student both of philosophy and of the tradition of the Church. His studies led him to regard the teaching of Paschasius, which had probably become the most usually accepted doctrine, as contrary to reason and to the writings of the Fathers. In a letter addressed to Lanfranc, the prior of Bec, who subsequently became Archbishop of Canterbury,

¹ Paschasius Radbert, *De Corpore et Sanguine Dom.* i. 2, 5, iv. 1.

² Rabanus Maurus, *Ep. ad Heribald.* 33.

³ Ratramn, *De Corpore et Sanguine Dom.* 57.

⁴ See Gore, *Dissertations on Subjects connected with the Incarnation*, pp. 239-247.

dent that
all things
concern-
re is true
for "He
in earth."
he shape
ed to be
Christ after
ro Christi
reason the
the life of
ly, to be
d suffered
truth, and,
mystery is
s by His
must be
ficer. . . .
the Holy
and wine

e. The
with the
Mary and
explicitly
ntz, some
sius, and
of which
teaching
tly con-
doctrines

revived.
t Tours,
1040 A.D.,
n of the
ching of
usually
writings
the prior
nterbury,

, iv. 1.

ncarnation,

he declared his assent to 'the opinions of John the Scot¹ about the Eucharist,' and his rejection of those of Paschasius; and added that, if Lanfranc regarded John the Scot as a heretic, he must similarly condemn Ambrose, Jerome, and Augustine, as well as other Fathers.² This letter was read at a council held at Rome under Pope Leo IX. in 1050 A.D.; and a sentence of excommunication was passed upon Berengar in his absence.³ In the same year another council was held at Vercelli, to which Berengar was summoned. Being thrown into prison by King Henry I. of France, he did not appear. The council condemned 'the book of John the Scot on the Eucharist' and the opinion of Berengar.⁴ Shortly after this council he was released; and four years later he was cited to appear before a council to be held at Tours under the presidency of Hildebrand, afterwards Pope Gregory VII., as papal legate. Berengar was present at the council and affirmed, either as the expression of his real mind or under pressure, that 'the bread and wine of the altar are, after consecration, the Body and Blood of Christ.'⁵ In 1059 A.D., when Nicolas II. was Pope, another council was held at Rome, at which Berengar was again present. The outcome of the council was that he was forced to assent to a document drawn up by Cardinal Humbert asserting in the most unequivocal terms and in language of a materialistic type the change of the bread and wine into the Body and Blood of Christ. In this document it was declared:

'I, Berengar, . . . having knowledge of the true and apostolic faith, anathematize every heresy, especially that for which I have hitherto been in ill repute, which attempts to affirm that the bread and wine which are placed upon the altar are after consecration only a Sacrament and not the real (verum) Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, and that these cannot with the senses (sensualiter), but only by way of Sacrament (nisi in solo sacramento), be held or broken by the hands of the priests, or crushed (atteri) by the teeth of the faithful. And I assent to the holy Roman Church and Apostolic See, and with my mouth and with my heart I profess that concerning the Sacrament of the Table of the Lord I hold the faith which the Lord and venerable Pope Nicolas and this holy synod have by

¹ It is probable that the book mentioned by Berengar and others as the work of John the Scot, *i.e.* Erigena, was really the treatise of Ratramn already referred to. See *e.g.* Gore, *op. cit.* p. 240, note 2. Miss Alice Gardner, in her *Studies in John the Scot*, pp. 85-93, leaves the question open.

² Hardouin, *Concilia*, vi. (1), 1015-1016.

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ *Ibid.* 1017-1018.

⁵ *Ibid.* 1041-1042; Gieseler, *Compendium of Ecclesiastical History*, ii. 402, note 12 (Eng. trans.)

evangelical and apostolical authority delivered to be held and have confirmed to me—namely, that the bread and wine which are placed upon the altar are after consecration not only a Sacrament but also the real (verum) Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, and that with the senses (sensualiter), not only by way of Sacrament but in reality (non solum sacramento sed in veritate), these are held and broken by the hands of the priests and crushed (atteri) by the teeth of the faithful.¹

After his assent, such as it was, to this document, Berengar continued to give utterance to his former opinions. He was, nearly twenty years later, again summoned to Rome, and in a council held in 1079 A.D. under Pope Gregory VII., after some resistance and verbal evasions² he agreed to assent to the following statement:

'I, Berengar, believe with my heart and confess with my mouth that the bread and wine which are placed upon the altar are by means of the mystery of the holy prayer and the words of our Redeemer substantially changed (substantialiter converti) into the real and true (veram et propriam) and life-giving Flesh and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, and that after consecration there is the real (verum) Body of Christ which was born of the Virgin and which was offered for the salvation of the world and hung upon the cross, and which sits at the right hand of the Father, and the real (verum) Blood of Christ which flowed from His side, not only by way of sign and of the virtue of the Sacrament (per signum et virtutem sacramenti) but in truth of nature and reality of substance (in proprietate naturæ et veritate substantiæ).'³

Between the council of 1059 A.D. and that of 1079 A.D. several treatises of importance in the Eucharistic controversy were published. That of Lanfranc, entitled *Of the Body and Blood of the Lord*, is a defence of the doctrine expressed in the declaration drawn up by Cardinal Humbert and accepted by Berengar in 1059 A.D., and an attack upon the latter, whom he represents as having taught that the Sacrament is merely a memorial of Christ.⁴ In Berengar's reply, *On the Holy Supper*, he defended his appeal to logic and maintained that in religion majorities may often be wrong, and in his statements about his own opinions affirmed the reality of the presence of the Body and Blood of Christ no less clearly than

¹ Hardouin, *Concilia* vi. (1), 1064.

² He tried for a time to take 'substantialiter' in the sense of 'salva substantia,' the bread 'non amittens quod erat, sed assumens quod non erat.'

³ *Ibid.* 1585.

⁴ Lanfranc, *De Corpore et Sanguine Dom.* 22.

the perm
monk, af
Reality
mentione
Berengar
while de
wine, ass

'All t
and wine
differ mu
there is n
these are
however,
departing
Lord are
therein c
way impa
And they
himself.'

Ag
asserts
means c
and wi
Christia
being di
that the
fragmen
alike, th
but he
(corpora

The
Tours
express
Blood
contenc
and in
urged l
of the 1

'Th
altar, an

¹ Be
Gore, of
² W
³ *Ib*
⁴ *Ib*

the permanence of the bread and wine.¹ Witmund, a Norman monk, afterwards Archbishop of Aversa, in his treatise *On the Reality of the Body and Blood of Christ in the Eucharist*, mentioned two schools of thought among the followers of Berengar, and associated Berengar himself with that which, while denying any change in the substance of the bread and wine, asserted the presence of the Body and Blood of Christ.

'All the Berengarians,' he says, 'agree in this, that the bread and wine are not changed in essence (essentialiter), but . . . they differ much in this, that some of them say that in these Sacraments there is nothing at all of the Body and Blood of the Lord, but that these are merely shadows and signs (umbras et figuras). Others, however, yielding to the valid arguments of the Church, and yet not departing from their folly . . . say that the Body and Blood of the Lord are really (revera) there, but are in a hidden fashion (latenter) therein contained (contineri), and, to use such a word, in a kind of way impanate (quodammodo impanari), so that they can be received. And they say that the latter more subtle opinion is that of Berengar himself.'²

Against both schools of Berengarians alike, Witmund asserts that the Body and Blood of Christ are present by means of a change in the essence (essentialiter) of the bread and wine,³ and that the Body is eaten by the teeth of Christians.⁴ He allows the possibility of the Body of Christ being divided into portions, though inclining to the opinion that the whole Body of Christ is in every Mass and in every fragment of the bread.⁵ He maintains that all communicants alike, the bad as well as the good, receive the Body of Christ, but he who communicates unworthily receives it 'bodily' (corporaliter) only and not spiritually' (spiritualiter).⁶

The writings of Hildebert, who became Metropolitan of Tours in 1124 A.D., were, to some extent, an attempt to express the doctrine of the real presence of the Body and Blood of Christ for which Lanfranc and Humbert had contended, in less materialistic language than they had used, and in a way which might free it from objections felt and urged by Berengar. In his *Short Treatise on the Sacrament of the Altar* he says:

'The Flesh of Christ daily comes from heaven towards us to the altar, and from the altar into us; and yet it leaves not the heaven

¹ Berengar, *De Sacra Cæna*, pp. 51, 248 (ed. Vischer), quoted by Gore, *op. cit.* p. 256.

² Witmund, *De Corporis et Sanguinis Christi Veritate in Euch.* i. 8.

³ *Ibid.* e.g. i. 9.

⁴ *Ibid.* e.g. i. 10.

⁵ *Ibid.* i. 15-18.

⁶ *Ibid.* iii. 51.

from which it comes. For as of old the Godhead of Christ came to us from heaven, so also now His Manhood comes thence to us; and as He came from heaven with His Godhead and yet did not depart thence, so also now He comes from heaven with His Manhood, which nevertheless always abides there. And as the Godhead came by means of the Manhood, so also the Manhood comes thence by means of the Godhead. At that time God came openly by means of His Manhood; and now Man comes invisibly by means of His Godhead. Then God came in a way known to the senses (sensibiliter); now Man comes in a way the senses cannot discern (insensibiliter). Then God in human fashion (humane); and now Man after the manner of God (divine). Nor is it Man only in His spirit, but also in His flesh; neither is it without His Godhead, but with and in and by reason of His Godhead (cum sua, et in sua, et ex sua divinitate); and therefore the whole work is divinely done (totum geritur divine). For what is more divine than that the Body of Christ, since it is flesh and not spirit, is nevertheless the food, not of the flesh and the body, but of the spirit and the mind? It is indeed the food of the inner man; and yet it is not human but divine, entering into the spirit in a spiritual and divine manner, not converting itself into spirit, but feeding the spirit spiritually and divinely, entering spiritually, working spiritually, coming by a spiritual way from heaven, returning to heaven by a spiritual way. This body is among us, and it is in heaven; it is among us also in different places, upon different altars, at a time not different. Nor is it divided into parts, but it is on every altar whole and complete. Nor is it in number more than one, but it is one only (nec alterum et alterum, sed numero unum). Nor is it imaginary (phantasticum), but it is real (verum). Nor is it only by way of Sacrament (in sacramento), but it is of the Body itself (in semetipso). For it is itself in one place only after a natural manner (modo naturali), but in many places after a manner of power (modo virtuali). In one place by way of nature, in many places by way of divine grace and power. In one place after a bodily manner, in many places after a spiritual manner.¹

'When the Sacrament is divided into parts, nevertheless the Body is not severed into parts so as to be taken with division and in portions (divisim et per partes); but it is received whole and undivided under the divided particles in every particle by each one who receives.'²

'The substance of the bread and wine is changed into the substance of the Body and Blood of the Lord; and yet the accidents of the bread and of the wine are not in like manner changed; but they remain unchanged, without the substance of bread and the substance of wine.'³

The best known theologian of the twelfth century is Peter Lombard. His scanty treatment of the Eucharistic sacrifice

¹ Hildebert, *Brevis Tractatus de Sacramento Altaris*, 1-2.

² *Ibid.* 6.

³ *Ibid.* 7.

has alr
Presen
work, t
there is
logy and
doctrine
saying
'the ch
substan
'thing'
signified
from th
condem

'who as
Christ, a
(convert
"This i
For the
Sacrame
that it is

He

'the re
over, th
species
the Bod

and tha

'the Bo
good to

'TH
that of
no sub
cannot
stantial
recogn
relation
opinion
on the
that th

¹ Pe

² *Ib*

⁴ *Ib*

the who

³ *Ib*

⁴ *Ib*

has already been mentioned. With the doctrine of the Presence in the Sacrament he dealt more fully. In his great work, the *Sentences*, as in the *Short Treatise* of Hildebert, there is an attempt to avoid the more materialistic phraseology and statements of an earlier time while maintaining the doctrine which they were intended to preserve. At the saying of the words 'This is My Body,' 'This is My Blood,' 'the change (*conversio*) of the bread and wine into the substance of the Body and Blood of Christ takes place.'¹ The 'thing' (*res*) which is 'contained' (*contenta*) as well as signified in the Sacrament 'is the Flesh of Christ which He took from the Virgin, and the Blood which He shed for us.'² He condemns in the most emphatic language those

'who assert that on the altar there is not the Body or Blood of Christ, and that the substance of bread and wine is not changed (*converti*) into the substance of flesh and blood, and that Christ said "This is My Body" as the Apostle said "The rock was Christ." For they say that the Body of Christ is there only by way of Sacrament (*in sacramento*), that is by way of symbol (*in signo*), and that it is eaten by us symbolically (*in signo*) only.'³

He maintains that

'the real (*verum*) Body and Blood of Christ are on the altar; moreover, the whole Christ (*integrum Christum*) is there under each species; and the substance of the bread is changed (*converti*) into the Body, and the substance of the wine into the Blood';⁴

and that

'the Body of Christ is taken by the good and by the bad; but by the good to salvation, by the bad to destruction.'⁵

'The only substance' in the Sacrament, he teaches, 'is that of the Body and Blood of the Lord';⁶ 'after consecration no substance of bread or wine is there';⁷ yet he says he cannot define whether the 'change' (*conversio*) is 'substantial' (*substantialis*) or 'of some other kind,'⁸ and recognizes the difficulty of questions which arise as to the relations of the 'accidents.'⁹ He expressly rejects the opinion held by some, and, as he tells us, defended by them on the ground of the declaration extorted from Berengar that there is a fraction and division of the Body of Christ;

¹ Peter Lombard, *Sent.* IV. viii. 3.

² *Ibid.* IV. viii. 4.

³ *Ibid.* IV. x. 1.

⁴ *Ibid.* IV. x. 4. In IV. xi. 6 he discusses the question why, since the whole Christ is under each species, the two species were instituted.

⁵ *Ibid.* IV. ix. 3.

⁶ *Ibid.* IV. xii. 1.

⁷ *Ibid.* IV. xi. 4.

⁸ *Ibid.* IV. xi. 1.

⁹ *Ibid.* IV. xii. 1-5.

and he inclines to the belief that, while the fraction is real (vera) and not merely apparent as some thought,¹ it is of the species of bread, not of the substance of the body.²

The term 'transubstantiation' (transubstantiatio) and the corresponding verb (transubstantiare) appear to have come into use in the eleventh or twelfth century.³ There is no evidence whether, as originally employed, they were intended to denote the change of the substance of the bread and wine into the Body and Blood of Christ or were used in a more general sense to express the doctrine that the bread and wine are, after consecration, the Body and Blood. Early in the thirteenth century the verb is found in a document of great importance, the decree of the Fourth Lateran Council (1215 A.D.) on the subject of the Eucharist. The decrees assented to by this council, held under Pope Innocent III., made binding upon the Western Church the doctrine expressed in the following terms, and gave it special emphasis by placing it together with the dogmas of the Holy Trinity and the Incarnation:

'There is one universal Church of the faithful, outside which no one at all is in a state of salvation (salvatur). In this Church Jesus Christ Himself is both priest and sacrifice; and His Body and Blood are really (veraciter) contained in the Sacrament of the altar under the species of bread and wine, the bread being transubstantiated (transubstantiatis) into the Body and the wine into the Blood by the power of God, so that, to effect the mystery of unity, we ourselves receive of that which is His what He Himself received of that which is ours (ut ad perficiendum mysterium unitatis accipiamus ipsi de suo quod accepit ipse de nostro). And, moreover, no one can consecrate (conficere) this Sacrament except a priest who has been duly ordained according to the keys of the Church, which Jesus Christ Himself gave to the Apostles and their successors.'⁴

¹ 'Quibusdam placet, quod non sit ibi fractio sicut videtur; sed dicitur frangi quia videtur frangi.'

² Peter Lombard, *Sent.* IV. xii. 2-5.

³ 'The term transubstantiation was apparently first used casually by Hildebert of Tours (beginning of twelfth century) in his 93rd sermon (Migne, clxxi. 776), and therefore already existed'; Harnack, *History of Dogma*, vi. 51 (Eng. trans.) 'The word "transubstantiare" is first, apparently, found in Stephen of Autun (c. A.D. 1112-1139), *Tract. de Sacr. Altaris*, c. 14 (*P.L.* clxxii. 1293); Gore, *op. cit.* p. 268, note 3. If the treatise *Expositio Canonis Missæ* is by St. Peter Damian, who died in 1072 A.D., there is an earlier instance of the noun, for in § 7 of that treatise the sentence 'quando profertur ipsum pronomen' (i.e. 'hoc' in 'hoc est corpus meum') 'nondum est transubstantiatio' occurs. For Cardinal Mai's reasons for thinking this treatise to be the work of St. Peter Damian, see in Migne, *P.L.* cxlv. 803.

⁴ Hardouin, *Concilia*, vii. 15-18.

This affirming wine is Christ i stance o can be to be M question stantiati intende and win self, wh bread a stance and wi been th from ch the br become in the words ' it is no ment to

Lat by the and cl teaching the Sa cerned recogn authori the sub 'canno rejecte substan

¹ In this Pop substan Lateran Palmer, also Pu pp. 17- et Sacr

² Or ii. 165-
³ St
⁴ Ib

This decree has most usually been interpreted as expressly affirming the doctrine that the substance of the bread and wine is changed into the substance of the Body and Blood of Christ in such a way that there no longer remains any substance of bread and wine in the consecrated elements. There can be little doubt that this doctrine had by this time come to be held by most Western theologians. But it may be questioned whether the phrase 'the bread being transubstantiated into the Body and the wine into the Blood' was intended to commit the Church to more than that the bread and wine are the Body and Blood. Pope Innocent III. himself, while holding as a certain truth that the substance of the bread and wine is changed by the consecration into the substance of the Body and Blood of Christ so that of the bread and wine only the accidents and properties remain, has been thought by some writers to have deliberately refrained from charging with heresy the opinion that the substance of the bread and wine remains in the elements which have become by consecration the Body and Blood of Christ.¹ And in the absence of evidence as to the exact meaning of the words 'transubstantiatio' and 'transubstantiare' at this time, it is not well to be too positive as to the force of the statement to which the Fourth Lateran Council gave its assent.²

Later in the thirteenth century the doctrine usually held by the schoolmen was expressed with characteristic fulness and clearness by St. Thomas Aquinas. According to his teaching, 'the real (verum) Body and Blood of Christ are in the Sacrament' of the Eucharist.³ They 'cannot be discerned by the senses or the understanding,' but are to be recognized 'only by faith (sola fide) which rests upon the authority of God.'⁴ The opinion that 'after the consecration the substance of bread and wine remains in the Sacrament' 'cannot be maintained' (stare non potest), and 'is to be rejected as heretical' (vitanda est tanquam heretica);⁵ this substance is not indeed 'annihilated' (non annihilatur), nor is

¹ Innocent III., *De Myst. Missæ*, iv. 7-9. For the contention that this Pope did not regard the assertion of the continued existence of the substance of the bread and wine as heretical, and that the Fourth Lateran Council did not impose the opposite belief as necessary, see Palmer, *A Treatise on the Church of Christ*, ii. 166-170 (edition 3). See also Pusey, *The Doctrine of the Real Presence as contained in the Fathers*, pp. 17-18. On the other side, see Franzelin, *Tract. de SS. Euch. Sacram. et Sacrif.* pp. 202-203.

² On the relation of this decree to the council, see Palmer, *op. cit.* ii. 165-166.

³ St. Thomas Aquinas, *S.T. III.* lxxv. 1.

⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵ *Ibid.* III. lxxv. 2.

it resolved into some more elementary material condition (in præjacentem materiam), but it is changed (convertatur) into the Body and Blood of Christ.¹ This 'change' (conversio) is 'wholly supernatural' (omnino supernaturalis); it is 'effected simply by the power of God'; it is 'substantial' (substantialis), and 'by a distinctive name can be called transubstantiation' (proprio nomine potest dici transubstantiatio).² The transubstantiation is such that it is of the substance only, so that, 'when the consecration has taken place, all the accidents (accidentia) of bread and wine remain.'³ It is a necessary part of the Catholic faith that 'the whole Christ (totus Christus) is in the Sacrament,'⁴ and that He is wholly in each species⁵ and in every fragment of them.⁶ Christ is not present in the Sacrament 'as in a place' (sicut in loco) and 'locally' (localiter).⁷ Hence it follows that Christ 'is not moved' in the Sacrament, 'so far as He Himself is concerned' (per se), but only 'in an accidental way' (per accidens) 'in relation to the movement of that in which He is' (ad motum ejus in quo est);⁸ and He is in it 'after an immovable manner' (immobiliter).⁹ The 'accidents' of the bread and wine which remain in the consecrated Sacrament are 'without a subject' (sine subjecto);¹⁰ they retain the capacity of affecting external objects (possunt immutare exteriora corpora);¹¹ they can become corrupted;¹² they retain the power of imparting physical nourishment;¹³ and they can be broken, and, when the fraction takes place, it is of them, not of the Body of Christ.¹⁴

Throughout this elaboration of the doctrine of Transubstantiation, as in his theological system generally, St. Thomas Aquinas presupposes the truth of the Aristotelian philosophy as held and expounded in the Middle Ages; and builds upon the opinion that the substance of any object, which gives to it its essential being, is something outside the cognizance of the senses, and additional to all those qualities by which the object is seen or felt or produces physical effects.

Three motives may be discerned in the treatment of the doctrine of the Presence in the Eucharist by the schoolmen. First, they were intent on preserving the traditional teaching, inherited from the patristic period, that the consecrated Sacrament is the Body and Blood of Christ. Secondly, they

¹ *Ibid.* III. lxxv. 3.² *Ibid.* III. lxxv. 4.³ *Ibid.* III. lxxvi. 1.⁴ *Ibid.* III. lxxvi. 3.⁵ *Ibid.* III. lxxvi. 6.⁶ *Ibid.* III. lxxvii. 3.⁷ *Ibid.* III. lxxvii. 6.⁸ *Ibid.* III. lxxv. 5.⁹ *Ibid.* III. lxxvi. 2.¹⁰ *Ibid.* III. lxxvi. 5.¹¹ *Ibid.* III. lxxvii. 1.¹² *Ibid.* III. lxxvii. 4.¹³ *Ibid.* III. lxxvii. 7.

wished to
and tho
century.
the doct
harmoni
prie in

Thus
of the I
than is f
the Mic
Presenc
to the d

ART.

1. *The*

AL

2. *Lives*

Gi

Re

Wi

3. *Will*

tion

4. *St. G*

(E

5. *Chap*

By

18

6. *Pro*

Pr

Fr

(E

7. *The*

un

Sc

(E

THE un
which

¹ Ca
the deve
is proba

wished to avoid those materialistic methods of phraseology and thought which had been prominent in the eleventh century. In the third place, they were desirous of stating the doctrine of the Eucharist in such a way that it would harmonize with the dominant Aristotelianism, and be appropriate in their whole theological and philosophical system.¹

Thus, the schoolmen, while maintaining the general idea of the Eucharistic sacrifice, suggest less with regard to it than is found at an earlier time or in the liturgical writers of the Middle Ages; but, in the matter of the Eucharistic Presence, added great developments and elaborate definitions to the doctrine which they received.

(To be continued.)

ART. VII.—THE UNITED FREE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND.

1. *The Booke of the Universall Kirk of Scotland.* Edited by ALEXANDER PETERKIN, Esq. (Edinburgh, 1839.)
2. *Lives of Ebenezer Erskine, William Wilson, and Thomas Gillespie, fathers of the United Presbyterian Church.* By Revs. JAMES HARPER, D.D., JOHN EADIE, LL.D., and WILLIAM LINDSAY, D.D. (Edinburgh, 1849.)
3. *William Carstares: a Character and Career of the Revolutionary Epoch.* By R. H. STORY, D.D. (London, 1874.)
4. *St. Giles' Lectures.* First Series. 'The Scottish Church.' (Edinburgh, 1881.)
5. *Chapters from the History of the Free Church of Scotland.* By the Rev. NORMAN L. WALKER, D.D. (Edinburgh, 1895.)
6. *Proceedings of the Free Church General Assembly, United Presbyterian Synod, and General Assembly of the United Free Church of Scotland,* October–November 1900. (Edinburgh, 1900.)
7. *The Layman's Book of the General Assembly of 1901,* issued under the auspices of the Elders' Union of the Church of Scotland, and edited by the Rev. H. M. B. REID, D.D. (Edinburgh, 1901.)

THE union of the Free and the United Presbyterian Churches, which was effected on October 31 last year, has aroused

¹ Canon Gore (*op. cit.* pp. 229–286) has assigned an important part in the development of Transubstantiation to the influence of Nihilianism. It is probable that this influence was less than he is disposed to think.

the sympathetic interest of multitudes who have no immediate concern with the Presbyterianism of Scotland. Nor ought the Church of England, episcopal though she be, to withhold her expression of sincere thankfulness for an event full of the happiest auguries for the future of Christendom. It is in no spirit of superior patronage that our congratulations will be offered. Even if we were tempted to adopt the attitude of the dispassionate critic towards the conflicts and oppositions, the reconciliations and treaties, of sectarian rivalry, the error would be at once corrected by a wider outlook upon facts. In a country whose right to representation in the Imperial Parliament, if measured only by the aggregate of population, is actually smaller than that of London, the inhabitants may be allowed, if it pleases them, to follow their own prejudices in religious doctrine and worship, and the world in general be little the better or the worse for any spiritual revolutions that may take place among them. So might Englishmen have thought a hundred, or even fifty years ago. But to-day such language would be impossible. Recent events have pressed upon us the consciousness of empire, till we have almost grown weary of the idea. The Englishman, as such, has no longer the predominant position among the subjects of the British Crown. The citizens of the great federal States beyond the seas have all an equal standing in the larger unity of Greater Britain. This is a fact which alters the proportions of everything, and, though it does not destroy the claim of the English Church to be regarded as the premier religious communion of the British people, yet reveals the importance of other Christian bodies, which otherwise the untravelled Englishman might easily neglect. The Presbyterian Churches, which are dominant in Scotland, have a wider field for their activities. At the first General Assembly of the United Free Church congratulatory addresses were received from Presbyterians in every quarter of the globe. If the Anglican Church is imperial, so also is the Presbyterian. Nor is it necessarily a reflexion upon the zeal and energy of our own communion to find that in these new countries, where a free field is allowed to all religious bodies, and there are no historical conditions favourable to the growth of any one confession, the relative strength of the Anglican and Presbyterian communities is by no means proportionate to the relative size of the older countries from which they spring. The Scotsman, with his enterprise, his energy, his adaptability to circumstances, has achieved for himself a position of power and influence in our self-governing colonies,

which ha
would, t
importan
the three
the issue
ill-advis
significa
of religi
react up
place in
together
Christ.

Then
suggested
English
eyes are
the rela
of Scotl
connexio
we see
people o
this half
In what
ment?
minster
structure
of the
sophistic
Church
blishmen
standing
church a
possible
are man
town.
all appa
possessio
One of t
or was, t
Presbyte
they rep
tions.
anxious
stand So
ramifica

which has tended to the advantage of Presbyterianism. It would, therefore, be a profound mistake to treat an event so important in the life of Scotland as the union of two out of the three great sections of its Presbyterian Church as though the issue were mainly, if not purely, local. We should be ill-advised indeed if we made no effort to understand the significance of a union which is bound to modify the history of religion among all the English-speaking peoples, and to react upon the larger problem, which occupies a foremost place in the prayers of all earnest Christian men, the gathering together in one of the divided Church of the Lord Jesus Christ.

There is another point of view from which the study suggested by this union is seen to have a peculiar interest for English Churchmen at the present time. Longing and wistful eyes are turned across the border, where, it is thought, in the relation between the State and the Established Church of Scotland, we may witness an object lesson in the ideal connexion between the spiritual and civil power. There also we see a self-acting, self-governing Church. But half the people of Scotland are not satisfied with this ideal. Of this half the vast majority constitute the United Free Church. In what, then, does this society differ from the Establishment? Not in doctrine, for its standard is the Westminster Confession of Faith. Not in organization, for its structure is parallel in every essential feature with that of the Church of Scotland. Not in worship, for no unsophisticated stranger who should enter a Presbyterian Church could say whether he was conforming to the Establishment or joining the ranks of Dissent. Here is the standing despair of the Englishman. In his own country church and chapel are sufficiently defined. No confusion is possible, where the traditions alike of teaching and of worship are manifestly dissimilar. But he enters some small Scottish town. He finds three, if not four, churches, all Presbyterian, all apparently adequate for the needs of the place, yet each possessing its own minister and its own separate organization. One of these, he is told, is the parish church, and another is, or was, the Free, while the existence of a couple of United Presbyterian Churches is explained by the information that they represent respectively the Secession and Relief congregations. All this is sufficiently bewildering, but when the anxious inquirer learns further that he cannot hope to understand Scottish Presbyterianism until he has followed out the ramifications of Burghers and Antiburghers, Auld Lights and

New Lights, Reformed Presbyterians and Original Seceders, he gives up the problem in despair. It is a labyrinth whose intricacies none but the initiated may trace.

Yet there is a clue, and a fairly simple one. View the history of Protestantism in Scotland from 1560, the date of the first General Assembly, as a prolonged conflict between Church and State, in which the Crown and the nobility, though sometimes disunited, represent the State, and the popular religious ideal as embodied in the General Assembly represents the Church, and you are at once able to interpret an otherwise perplexed and perplexing story. The High Churchman who should apply to the case of Scotland the theory, well-worn since Bossuet first announced it, of the inevitable tendency to division inherent in Protestantism, would be maintaining a plausible but unhistorical position. The United Free Church, which for all practical purposes may be regarded as comprising all the Presbyterians of Scotland who are not members of the Establishment, is a refutation of such an argument. The Presbyterian sects are not the result of an exaggerated private judgment, which, making mountains out of molehills, is willing to rend the body for points of doctrine microscopic in their minuteness. R. L. Stevenson, in a passage of inimitable beauty, has compared the ecclesiastical divisions of Scotland to the chalk-marks on the floor, which two quarrelsome sisters, compelled to inhabit one room, fixed as the gulf of separation which neither might pass. A plausible and picturesque illustration, but not true. One question, and one question alone, has divided Scottish Presbyterianism, and that is the relation between Church and State, the limits of civil interference, the independence of spiritual jurisdiction. From the deposition of Ebenezer Erskine in 1740, and the foundation of the Secession Church down to the Disruption of 1843—the greatest crisis that has occurred in Scotland since the Reformation—this cause, and this cause alone, has been the fruitful parent of Nonconformity.

When this leading thought is kept in mind, the recent union of the Free and United Presbyterian Churches appears in an entirely new light. The United Free Church, far from being a reconciliation of hitherto hostile forces, is the consummation, the inevitable goal of tendencies which have been operating in Scotland since the Revolution. One after another the Established Church has thrown off secessions, the principle of whose separate existence has been the same, a pure Gospel and spiritual independence. With two excep-

tions,
terians
United
last an
inevita
mutual
commo
union a
that an
with t
movem
stood t
which
unreal.
its pro
promise
end.
Modera
Establis
been ta
common
question
virtually

The
interest
realize
moment
jurisdic
It has
tions su
There an
There a
attention
troversy

The
cannot b
historical
of 1690,
and Prel
made the
composed
Secession
Ebenezer
1733, the
Gairney

tions, all the movements among non-established Presbyterians have been in the direction of unification—first the United Secession Church; next the United Presbyterians; last and greatest of all, the United Free Church. It was inevitable that communities which had not arisen out of mutual antagonisms, but solely out of resistance to one common principle, should feel the necessity of corporate union and coalesce into one body. We are far from saying that antipathies, inherited in part from former connexion with the Establishment, were not present to retard the movement towards union. Nor do we wish it to be understood that the larger hope of yet further approximations, which the event of last year encourages, is visionary and unreal. On the contrary, like all similar events, it has its prospective as well as its retrospective aspect; it is a promise as well as a fulfilment; a beginning, as well as an end. 'We must and do recognize,' said the retiring Moderator at the opening of the succeeding Assembly of the Established Church, 'that one great step at all events has been taken towards the healing of the breaches of our common Presbyterianism.' But none the less the great question at issue in the ecclesiastical life of Scotland is virtually untouched by what has taken place.

The United Free Church, therefore, is a peculiarly interesting subject of study for English Churchmen, who realize the importance among ourselves at the present moment of the struggle to assert an independent spiritual jurisdiction and to gain freedom of representative action. It has this definite advantage. There are no complications such as arise in the case of the Church of England. There are no questions of orders and of historical continuity. There are few side issues. We can watch with undivided attention the progress through many vicissitudes of a controversy of which the main issues remain unchanged.

The present condition of ecclesiastical affairs in Scotland cannot be rightly understood unless we approach the subject historically. We must get behind the Revolution Settlement of 1690, behind the long struggle between Presbyterianism and Prelacy, if we are to appreciate the forces which have made the United Free Church. The elements of which it is composed are briefly stated thus. First in order comes the Secession Church which resulted from the deposition of Ebenezer Erskine, and the date of which is usually given as 1733, the year of the meeting of the Associate Presbytery at Gairney Bridge. Within a few years of its formation this

body divided into two sections on a question of conscience suggested by the Burgh Oath, an old test which disappeared at the Reform Act of 1832. These subdivisions were known as Burghers and Antiburghers. But with the growth of larger views and the dawn of 'new light,' the parties began to draw together again, till at length in 1828 they joined hands in what was called the United Secession Church. On either side, however, there was a section of irreconcilables, respectively the Auld Licht Burghers and the Auld Licht Antiburghers. The former went back to the Establishment in 1839, at the height of the 'Ten Years' Conflict,' which resulted in the great cleavage of 1843. There can be no doubt that it was the growth of those opinions which produced the Disruption and for nine years commanded a majority in the General Assembly, that recovered this wandering remnant of Dissenters. We shall, then, be probably right in regarding them as a tributary stream to the United Free Church through the channel of the Disruption. As for the Auld Licht Antiburghers, the Free Church had not long been constituted before they too became merged in its ranks. Not, however, the whole of the membership, for an attenuated remainder, calling itself the Original Secession Church, has clung to a position of splendid isolation, exercising no influence upon the national life, and being at length rewarded with a transient fame as the Auld Lights of Mr. J. M. Barrie's romances. Next to these comes the 'Relief' Church, which owes its origin to the arbitrary and unjust deposition of Thomas Gillespie, minister of Charnock, in 1752. This was the body which in 1847 became, together with the United Secession Church, the familiar United Presbyterians, one of the parties to the recent union. The other party, which by its very bulk, no less than by the circumstances of its origin, has recalled Scottish Nonconformity from the byways of a dissident Dissent to the highway of the national life, is the Free Church of Scotland. This body attracted to itself those Presbyterians who were unable to find a home in the Establishment, and whose testimony hitherto had only been that of an incoherent protesting minority. In 1863 the Cameronian remnant, calling itself the Reformed Presbyterian Church, which had never acquiesced in the Revolution Settlement, and to which the uncovenanted and moderate Presbyterian was almost as obnoxious as the Erastian and oppressive Episcopalian, recognized in the Free Church a return to purer Presbyterian principles and ceased to exist as an independent society. The final stage in the amalgamation of the

non-es
Chur
tient v
the U
Those
were
reach
which
cant b
the wh
legitim
Scottis
before
These,
whose
history

If
terianis
found i
traditio
Reform
period
aval hi
stateme
Reform
'certain
the Reg
the first
ecclesia
see, sec
spiritua
Scotlan
a consti
mediate
Englan
trace.

We sha
with the
was the
Acts of
inspired

Of t
not only
but also
Westmi

non-established Presbyterians, of which the United Free Church is the result, has been reached with scarcely a dissentient voice in either of the contracting parties. The vote of the United Presbyterian Church was practically unanimous. Those who in the Free Assembly passed the uniting act were more than 600 in number. The minority did not reach 30. It is true indeed that with a rare confidence, of which only Scotsmen with a principle are capable, the insignificant body of which these were the representatives has claimed the whole property of the Free Church, as alone possessing a legitimate title, but it is tolerably certain that, as a leading Scottish minister recently expressed it, 'they have no future before them, as far as influencing Scottish life is concerned.' These, then, are the elements of that United Free Church, whose position we shall now seek to examine in the light of history.

If the question be asked whence has Scottish Presbyterianism derived the principles of its life, the answer is to be found in the ideals of John Knox. We do not think that tradition has in the least distorted the true proportions of the Reformation by presenting Knox as the heroic figure of the period which immediately succeeded the downfall of the mediæval hierarchy. No one will venture seriously to question the statement that the life of Knox is the epitome of the Scottish Reformation. 'The Reformation,' says Dr. Donald Macleod, 'certainly owed much to the great ability and statesmanship of the Regent Murray; but Knox was its embodiment.' This is the first point to be borne in mind by any who wish to study ecclesiastical matters in Scotland. There were, as we shall see, secular forces which complicated the situation. But the spiritual issue was a simple one. All that was not papal in Scotland was gathered up in the Church to which Knox gave a constitution, a method of worship, a confession. Of intermediate parties, like those which divided the field in the England of Edward and Elizabeth, there is apparently no trace. Knox and the Reformation are convertible terms. We shall turn, then, to the Confession of 1560, of which Knox, with the aid of Willocks Craig, Erskine of Dun, and Winram, was the author, to the *First Book of Discipline*, to the early Acts of Assembly, for the ideals and principles which have inspired what we commonly call Scottish Presbyterianism.

Of these documents the Confession is doubly interesting, not only as the fundamental document of the Reformation, but also as the standard in reference to which even the Westminster Confession was accepted in Scotland. Some

authorities claim the Confession of 1560 as the ultimate court of appeal to this day. What, then, is the conception of the Church set forth in that Confession? The Kirk, which is 'Catholic, that is, universall,' is declared to be 'invisible, knowne onlie to God.' But a statement like this must not be supposed to lead to the erroneous inference that the Church has no practical, visible embodiment. From what follows it is clear that invisible here means little more than ideal, incapable of being realized under present conditions in an organized constitutional society. But the eighteenth section of the Confession, which treats '*of the Notes by which the True Kirk is discerned,*' makes it evident that as an actual, living, administrative authority the Church is as practical, as tangible a conception as it is to Romanist or Anglican. Particular Kirks, 'suche as was in Corinthus, Galatia, Ephesus,' such also as 'we, the inhabitants of the realme of Scotland, professors of Christ Jesus, professe our selves to have in our citeis, touns, and places reformed,' have a true jurisdiction from Christ. 'The Word truelie preached, and the sacraments rightlie ministred, and discipline executed according to the Word of God, be the certain and infallible signes of the true kirk.' In other words, to Knox and his fellow reformers, that body which met for the first time in General Assembly in the year 1560, was the true 'universalle Kirke of Scotland,' holding its jurisdiction from Christ alone; receiving its authority from, not giving its authority to, the Scriptures; and freed from the 'papistical (or pape's) kirk,' by which is always meant the unauthorized mediæval hierarchy, which had for centuries oppressed it, stifling its doctrine, hindering its evangelical discipline, and squandering its 'patrimony' on corrupt and ungodly prelates. We conceive, then, that the first Scottish reformers by no means regarded themselves as constructing a new Church upon the ruins of the old. The Church of Scotland, as they viewed it, was as it were the people of Israel emerging from the Egyptian bondage of the usurped authority of Rome.

The question that next arises—and it is one of crucial significance—is this, What, according to the ideal of Knox, was the essential feature in the constitution of this Church? The superficial student will reply that the essential feature of a Presbyterian Church is, of course, its government by presbyters. Was not the conflict extending over more than a century, through which the Scottish Church passed, a struggle between presbytery and prelacy? Is it not true that a succession through presbyters is claimed for the northern

establis
and of
who im
was en
of the
kind.
shall ne
Genera
first me
the pro
other o
seat of
ministe
congreg
appoint
by the
liminari
summon
ministe
of God'
heart.
giveth t
necessar
the peop
dination
A lawfu
of the
superint
of the e
Spottisw
serve as
asked if
If they
comfort
charge?
unto him
their pa
The esse
compose
stands o
people, a
obedienc
Church.
rightfully
elect of C

establishment? But the verdict alike of original documents and of history is entirely different. They misread history who imagine that the bitter strife by which Scotland was torn was engendered by a preference on the part of a large section of the people for parity of ministers. It was nothing of the kind. Let us go first to Knox's *Book of Discipline*. We shall not find in this document a complete organization. The General Assembly, for example, which had already held its first meeting, is not here mentioned except incidentally. But the provision made for the appointment of ministers and other officers of the Church sufficiently indicates what the seat of authority is. 'At such times as there wanteth a minister,' the ministers and elders are to summon the whole congregation concerned, 'and if there be choise, the church appoint two or three upoun some certane day, to be examined by the ministers and elders.' When all the necessary preliminaries have been completed the congregation is again summoned. 'Then, at after noone, the sermoun ended, the minister exhorteth them to the electioun, with the invocatioun of God's name, directing his prayer as God sall move his heart. In like maner, after the electioun, the minister giveth thanks to God, with request of suche things as sall be necessarie for his office. After that he is appointed minister, the people sing a psalme, and depart.' Here there is no ordination in the Catholic or even the Genevan sense of the word. A lawful ministry is clearly made to depend on the election of the people. The same is evidently the case with the superintendent or Knoxian bishop. The 'forme and order' of the election by the 'churches of Lothiane' of Mr. John Spottiswood is inserted in the *First Book of Discipline* to serve as a pattern in all similar elections. 'The people were asked if they wold have the said Mr. Johne superintendent? If they wold honour and obey him as Christ's minister, and comfort and assist him in every thing pertaining to his charge? They answered, "We will; and we doe promise unto him such obedience as becometh the sheepe to give to their pastor, so long as he remaineth faithfull in his office." The essentials of the form and order are here. The rest is composed of examination, prayer, and exhortation. What stands out clearly in this *First Book* is this: the Christian people, acting in dependence upon the Word of God and in obedience to the Evangel, is the spring of jurisdiction in the Church. Neither ministers, prelates, popes, nor kings can rightfully impose their will upon the people, which, as the elect of God, has autonomy in matters spiritual.

This is brought out with still greater precision in the *Second Book of Discipline* (1581), which elaborates the form of the Church as a spiritual authority. The jurisdiction of the Church, according to this book, is exercised by assemblies, which are of four sorts. With the last of these, which is practically an œcumenical council, we are not concerned. The other three are 'of particular kirks and congregations, ane or ma, or of a province, or of ane haill nation.' We recognize without any difficulty three of the courts of modern Presbyterianism—the Kirk Session, the Synod, the General Assembly. But where, we may well ask, is the Presbytery—that court which of all others would seem to be characteristic of the system? Its absence is the more remarkable as the Melvilles were already powerful in the ecclesiastical counsels of Scotland, and were already successfully impressing upon the Kirk the well-known Genevan model. The only conclusion is that the Presbytery is not of the essence of the Scottish ideal. The assemblies, which, though composed only of ministers and elders, are yet truly representative in character, must be taken to embody the true genius of the Scottish Reformation. Adopting, as the nation had, the Scriptures as the standard of appeal, it is easy to see how Andrew Melville, with his firm conviction that the Presbyterian model represented the pattern set forth in the Word of God, was able to secure its recognition and adoption. But it is one thing to see how this type made its way into the Kirk, and quite another to condemn modern Presbyterians in Scotland as untrue to their principles, if, as some do, they lean to Episcopacy as the more excellent way; or, as is the case with a larger number still, they express indifference as to the form which the ministry may take. The essentials of the Scottish Reformation may, as it seems to us, be summed up in the watchword—a free General Assembly, and there is no evidence that any appreciable number of Presbyterians are prepared, beyond the limitations which Establishment imposes, to depart from this ideal.

A free General Assembly, then, we take as the point from which the Church of Knox and his contemporaries starts. What this means may be gathered both from the definitions of the *Second Book of Discipline* and from the Acts of the Assembly itself from 1560 to 1610. The General Assembly is to provide for 'things generally serving for the weill of the haill bodie of the kirk within the realme.' It is to 'tak cair that kirks be plantit in places quhair they are not plantit'; to 'prescryve the rewll how the uther twa kynds of

assembl
to the
the spi
hurt of
kirk be
injunct
tance
congre
be seen
claim.
the spr
ecclesi
civil co
is jealo
it cons
call up
to tole
suprem

The
the Ge
which
Assem
introdu
charact
lay—b
Presby
tion.
prelacy
the for
this poi
the Kir
records
to repla
into th
the sup
substitu
the rest
the roy
popular

The
restorat
in the r
1572 an
history
though

assemblies sould proceed in all things'; to 'take heid'—and to this provision we would direct special attention—'that the spirituall jurisdiction and civill be not confoundit to the hurt of the kirk;' and to see 'that the patrimonie of the kirk be not diminishit nor abusit.' To this is added a general injunction 'to interpone autoritie' in all matters of importance that concern the welfare of all the churches or congregations in the realm. This represents, as will at once be seen, a fairly absolute authority, a wide and far-reaching claim. Not only is the Assembly the final court of appeal, the spring of all jurisdiction within the Church itself, but this ecclesiastical parliament, in the very spirit manifested by its civil counterpart in the struggle with the royal prerogative, is jealously to watch all encroachments of the State on what it considers its peculiar sphere of action. Such a body may call upon the King to enforce its decrees, but it is not likely to tolerate any counter-claim on the part of royalty to supremacy in all causes as well ecclesiastical as temporal.

That the conception of the powers and prerogatives of the General Assembly was no mere paper ideal, but a claim which was actually asserted again and again, the Acts of Assembly during the eventful years succeeding the re-introduction of Episcopacy bear abundant testimony. The character of this great struggle, in which the final victory lay—but only, as we shall see, in a modified form—with the Presbyterian, is still misrepresented by the popular imagination. It is regarded as a battle between presbytery and prelacy, the latter being championed by the Stewart kings, the former by a large body of the people of Scotland. But this point of view is scarcely accurate. The real contest was the King *versus* a free General Assembly. The Assembly's records make it plain that the object of the Crown was not to replace an unauthorized by a valid ministry, but to insert into the Kirk a jurisdiction which should gradually subvert the supremacy of the great religious council of the nation and substitute that hierarchy of bishops, deans, archdeacons, and the rest, which was instinctively felt to be more congenial to the royal claim than what was practically a democratic and popular control of ecclesiastical affairs.

The Assembly was not at first unwilling to consent to the restoration of the estate of bishops, if the balance of power in the nation seemed to demand this step. Consequently in 1572 an agreement was concluded with the State, known in history as the Concordat of Leith, which restored the office, though not the order, of prelates, with the significant

restriction, that in spiritual matters they should be subject to the Assembly. Thereafter their relation to the Church is made quite clear in the records of successive Assemblies. Take, for example, 'the General Assembly, begun and holden in Edinburgh, the saxt day of August 1573.' The list of those present is given as follows: 'Earles, Lords, Barrones, Bischops, Superintendants, Commissioners to plant Kirks, Commissioners of Provinces, Townes, and Kirks, with the Ministers.' Here it will be observed that the bishops occupy a place between the temporal lords and the administrative officials of the Kirk. They were, in fact, regarded as amphibians. Civilly they were an estate of the realm, though the Assembly scorns any deferential address, speaking always of 'Mr. Patrick Adamsonsone, callit Bischope of St. Androis,' or 'Mr. David Cunninghame, Bischope of Aberdeene.' On the other hand, as ministers they stood on the same footing as the rest, and exercised jurisdiction only so far as they were 'ordained' (*i.e.* commanded) by the Assembly, in precisely the same way as the superintendants, to exercise the oversight, not of the diocese whose name they bore, but of the kirks in a prescribed district. This list, then, being given, there follows a sentence of high significance. 'Mr. Arbuthnot was chosen Moderator.' Here we have an unmistakable witness to the freedom of the Assembly. It chooses its own president exactly as in the days when bishops were not, and the choice does not even fall upon one of them, but upon plain Mr. Arbuthnot. The Assembly so constituted and its successors claim unlimited control over the prelates as over all their members. No bishop is to 'giue collatione of any benefice within the bounds of Superintendants within his diocie, without their consent and testimonialls.' 'The Generall Assembly ordayne the Bischope of Dunkeld, betwixt and [*sic*] the next Assembly, to resort he and his family to Dunkeld, and make his residence there, under the paine of excommunicatione.' The Synodal Assemblies of St. Andrews, Aberdeen, Glasgow, and Moray, in the event of non-compliance of the bishops of these sees with an ordinance of the General Assembly, are bidden to 'appoynt certain breither of their ministrie to giue them publick admonitiones out of the pulpitt.' The poor prelates in question were doubtless only Tulchans or titulars, but it is quite certain that canonical consecration would not have improved their situation. The paramount authority of a free General Assembly was the one principle for which Scotland fought.

We
criticis
Scottis
James
schem
packed
possib
instru
scopal
spite
came
speaks

'Th
cration,
of a bis
ty ordi
sarilie
by reaso
them co
consecr
flockes,
people
and not
beene t
or they
the title
witt, M
Bishop
Gallow
this cor
without

This p
the tru
the at
which
It was
the rec
as in i
society
organ
was th
in its
regard
ideal o
At

We shall cite one more witness to this contention in the criticism which Calderwood makes on the consecration of Scottish bishops at London in 1610. The departure of James VI. for England enabled him to push forward his scheme for reducing the General Assembly. First he so packed that body that from 1602 until 1618, when it became possible to dispense with it altogether, it was virtually the instrument of its own destruction, and the Acts of the 'episcopal assemblies' were rescinded by the Church, when, in spite of the Crown, it regained its freedom in 1638. Then came the consecration in England, of which Calderwood thus speaks :

'There was no mention made in the Assemblie of their consecration, far lesse anie warrant for them to take upon them the office of a bishop, distinct from the office of a presbyter. They did onlie ty ordination, jurisdiction, plantation to them, as conjunct necessarilie with the presbyteries (I mean to such as were styled bishops, by reason of their benefices and titles therto). But they tooke upon them consecration to ane office ; and when they returned home they consecrated the rest of their fellows. All of them deserted their flocks, and usurped thereafter jurisdiction over the ministers, and people of their diocies, by vertue of their consecration to ane office, and *not by any delegate power from the Assemblie*, which might have beene taken away againe from anie of them by another Assemblie, or they did fall from it, in case they had been anie ways deprived of the title to the benefice, and vote in parliament. These three, to witt, Mr. Johne Spottiswode, Bishope of Glasco, Mr. Andrew Lamb, Bishope of Brechin, and Mr. Gavine Hammiltoun, Bishope of Galloway, were the thrie that brake off first, and boldlie accepted this consecration in the moneth of November, without warrant, yea, *without the knowledge or consent of the Kirk of Scotland.*'¹

This passage, especially the clauses we have italicised, make the true character of the conflict perfectly plain. It is not the attempt to replace one religious body by another to which objection is taken. This was not even contemplated. It was not the establishment of an office or order, or even the recovery of an apostolical succession, which was regarded as in itself unlawful. It was the intrusion upon an existing society, without its consent as expressed in its supreme organ of jurisdiction, of an institution, the purpose of which was the usurpation of that very authority which was ignored in its introduction. We have every reason, therefore, to regard a free General Assembly as the embodiment of the ideal of Knox, and therefore of the Scottish Reformation.

At this point we shall in all probability be met by an

¹ *History of the Kirk of Scotland*, vol. vii. p. 150.

objection that we are reconstructing the Reformation Kirk upon too narrow a base. A free General Assembly may be part of the ideal, but it is only a part. After all, the Reformers were Church and State men, and they were unhesitating in their demand that the spiritual should be closely allied to the civil power. Thus we shall find writers of the Established Church insisting upon the fact that the Reformers had no sympathy with the doctrines of the modern Liberationist.

'Not the Church alone,' says Dr. Macleod, 'but the nation and every member of the nation were bound to obey the Word of God. The Church and the nation were with Knox identical terms; and not with him only, for indeed neither Romish Church nor Protestant, no statesman or theologian of that time, ever dreamed of civil government being purely secular. Voluntaryism in the modern sense was not even discussed.

All this is, of course, indisputable, and, as an argument against Scottish Dissenters, makes a good appearance. But is it relevant? Because the conception of a severance betwixt Church and State was inconceivable to Knox, Winram, and the rest, is the 'Establishment principle,' as Scotsmen use to phrase it, necessarily involved in the Presbyterian ideal?

We are curiously reminded of the argument upon which the Free Church protesters of the other day based their claim to the property of the Church of 1843. Lord Low, in the Outer House of the Court of Session, has given judgment against them, but inasmuch as the case is likely to be appealed to the Inner House, and, if necessary, to the House of Lords, any review of that judgment in its legal aspects would be premature. Regarded, however, from the point of view of common sense, nine out of ten among impartial and reasonable men will feel that the last word has been said. The main position of the litigant minority is shortly as follows. The Free Church separated from the Establishment in 1843 in terms of a protest, laid on the table of the General Assembly, which embodied the 'Claim, Declaration, and Protest,' addressed to the Queen by the Assembly of the previous year. This claim declares that it is the duty of the civil magistrate 'to take order for the preservation of purity, peace, and unity in the Church.' This, it is contended, involves, and was meant by those who originally framed it to involve, the principle of establishment, and, inasmuch as the document in question is one of the title-deeds of the Free Church, union with any body which is not prepared to assert such a principle not only violates the constitution, but dis-

solves
questi
as rep
that I
out th
trate,
Chalm
was n
men
with t
broug
be. I
societ
and th
tion u
refuse
seems
upon
servat

W
the w
Scotti
tional
It is
strong
becau
as ot
eccles
princi
demon
his fai
gregat
his sch
only t
which
three
had fo
the d
Dutch
decla
conne
voice
determ
alone
which

solves the identity of the Church. The former is the legal question, upon which we do not venture to pronounce. But, as regards the latter, most people will probably recognize that Lord Low's argument is unanswerable, when he points out that this principle refers to the duty of the civil magistrate, and not directly to the duty of the Church. Thomas Chalmers might leave the establishment, protesting that he was no voluntary. The Free Church might be founded by men eager to proclaim that they had neither part nor lot with the enemies of an institution in which they had been brought up, and whose faithful servants they still wished to be. But to maintain as fundamental to the existence of a society, the obvious purpose of which is the worship of God and the spread of religion, a theory depending for its realization upon the consent of another party, which might either refuse action altogether or impose impossible conditions, seems to us scarcely less absurd than to require an opinion upon the Copernican astronomy or the policy of the Conservative party.

We may give this reasoning a wider range, applying it to the whole question of the fundamental principle of the Scottish Reformation, which we have described as constitutionally finding its embodiment in a free General Assembly. It is argued that, because the early Reformers asserted in strong terms the duty of the civil ruler to maintain religion, because in fact they were unable to conceive of the Church as otherwise than co-extensive with the State, therefore ecclesiastical establishment in some form or another is a first principle of the Scottish Presbyterian Church. We entirely demur to that position. What if Knox had foreseen that his failure to impose his discipline on the lords of the congregation, and to carry out in the teeth of the landed interest his scheme for dealing with the patrimony of the Kirk, was only the beginning of a struggle with the secular power, which in different forms has spread itself over more than three centuries, and is by no means settled yet? What if he had foreseen the crushing tyranny of Stewart absolutism, or the deadening influence of the Erastian opportunism of Dutch William? Could we imagine him for a moment declaring that neither was too great a price to pay for State connexion? That a prelatial hierarchy might stifle the free voice of the Christian people? That the civil courts might determine the limits of a jurisdiction received from Christ alone? And if, further, he had developed the conviction, which the experience of these things has produced among a

considerable proportion of the Scottish people, that what we now call establishment is inconsistent with the independence of the Church, is it not certain that the principle which he would have refused to abandon is that of a free General Assembly? We are not, let it be observed, arguing against religious establishments. But the phenomenon which we have undertaken to study is the United Free Church. And neither the history of which that body is the product, nor the present condition of Presbyterianism in Scotland, can, as we think, be understood in its true proportions without a full recognition of this fact.

This, then, is the question which now confronts us. Is the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland as now by law established possessed of a free jurisdiction in the sense of the *Second Book of Discipline*? For this question it will be simpler to substitute another. Was the Assembly which met on October 16, 1690, the first Assembly to be constituted after the abolition of Episcopacy, a free Assembly? We shall give, first of all, two opinions on the Revolution Settlement, under which this Assembly was summoned, and then inquire how far these opinions are justified by the facts.

The Established Church of Scotland has no defender more valiant or more jealous than Principal Story. We shall not therefore expect from him any judgment which allows undue weight to the indictments of its enemies. Yet this is how, in his *Life of William Carstairs*, Dr. Story has characterized the Revolution Settlement:

‘The “Revolution Settlement” was, of all conceivable settlements, the most “Erastian.” Parliament had broken down Presbytery, and set up Episcopacy in 1662. Parliament broke down Episcopacy, and set up Presbytery in 1689 and 1690. The one Parliament, no doubt, was but a servile junta; the other was a fairly representative body. But in neither case was the Church, whose fate was decreed, a party to the procedure. The State dealt with her as its obedient handmaid.’

The opinion of the civil lawyers, as expressed by Lord President Hope, will be even more surprising to those who, without knowing much of the ecclesiastical history of the North, cast wistful eyes across the Tweed in quest of an Established Church whose authority is not fettered by the State:

“That our Saviour is the Head of the Kirk of Scotland,” said the Lord President, “in any temporal or legislative or judicial sense is a position which I can signify by no other name than absurdity. The Parliament is the head of the Church, from whose acts, and

from whose acts alone, it exists as the National Church, and from which alone it derives all its powers. . . . Who gave the Church Courts any jurisdiction? The law, and that alone, gave it, and the law defines what it has so given."

These are representative opinions. We pass now to a brief review of the facts. That Dutch William was prepared to deal with ecclesiastical affairs in Scotland in such a manner as would best maintain the stability of his own throne, the unity of the two crowns, and the security of civil government, is undisputed. A sovereign who rests on divine right is likely to pursue methods different from those of the monarch whose only claim is popular consent. The former seeks to stifle, the latter to use, the forces astir within the nation. It is the method which differs; the end is in either case the same. The goal is the supremacy of the State. The one strives to reach it by the difficult and tortuous path of Thorough, the other by the broad highway of Moderation. The purpose and the policy of William III. are nowhere more apparent than in the measures which he pursued for the settling of religion in Scotland. To him bishops and dragoons represented the disastrous failure of the Stewarts. 'I will not lay myself under any obligation to be a persecutor' were his words to the commissioners of the Scottish Convention who administered the coronation oath. But even though he was accompanied by the Presbyterian chaplain, William Carstares, who was destined to become his chief adviser in Scottish affairs, it was by no means certain that bishops would disappear from the Parliament House at Edinburgh when the Prince of Orange landed at Torbay. The new king was already well established at St. James's before the fate of the Scottish hierarchy was irrevocably sealed. The South of Scotland was Presbyterian, but in the parts north of Tay the people were sufficiently contented with Episcopacy. And, if the southern districts were the busiest and most thickly populated, yet it was the great middle class, which the Reformation had created, and not the nobility and gentry, to whom the prelates as such were obnoxious. No wonder that William hesitated to divide in matters of religion the kingdoms which it would be his aim to weld in an ever closer unity. The obduracy of Bishop Rose revealed the true position of affairs. Episcopacy was not a religious ideal but the willing tool of the Court of St. Germain's, and for its abolition none but the prince's enemies would mourn. Presbyterianism, on the other hand, was a living spiritual force, cherished by those very sections

of the people which were readiest to support the new monarch. That decided the future of the Kirk.

It is important to notice exactly what happened. Not, in the first place, the disestablishment of one communion and the establishment of another. It is doubtful whether such a proceeding would be possible in any age, and in any case it could not have happened in the seventeenth century. Nor yet again was it a repetition of what took place at the Reformation, when the old hierarchy, the 'Pape's Kirk,' fell into ruins, and the Christian people of Scotland, the true Kirk of the country, according to the theory of the time, organized itself in a form which received the complete recognition of the State in 1592. This would only have been possible if the circumstances of the nation had permitted the summoning of a free General Assembly. What actually occurred was that William, by and with the advice of Parliament and under the influence of Carstares, ratified in the Act of 1690 the Westminster Confession, and settled Presbyterian government, providing for its exercise by the remnant of the ministers 'outed' in 1661 and those whom they might associate with them. This Act was modified by another in 1693, which provided that the Assembly should be summoned by the sovereign, and admitted to the Presbyteries, and thus to a share in the administration, Episcopal incumbents who were willing to make certain subscriptions. These provisions in themselves were quite sufficient to make the remodelled Establishment a very different institution from that which Knox had given to his native country. Even thus the genius of the Church would have been, not John Knox, but William Carstares. But in the original Act of 1690 another claim was asserted, which was the fruitful occasion of those controversies and divisions which have at length resulted in the existence of that great religious society outside the Established Church, which, so long as the schism lasts, will always be its most formidable rival in the allegiance and affections of the Scottish people. Parliament vested the patronage of livings in the heritors and elders of the parish, or, in the case of burghs, in the elders and town council. Now here we have a twofold departure from the principles of the Scottish Reformation. First of all there is the claim to regulate by statute the formation of the pastoral tie, and indirectly, therefore, to affect the courts of the Church, by sending to them ministers who were the nominees of Parliamentary patrons. That grievance has not been removed by the Patronage Act of 1874, which prescribed

the constituency of the electing body as precisely as any of its predecessors. The other departure is more apparent still. Elders represent the Church, but heritors and town councils, as such, do not. Heritors are landowners, and it was the true Presbyterian who exclaimed, in the words of the first of the Secession leaders, 'What difference does a piece of land make between man and man in the affairs of Christ's kingdom, which is not of this world?' The situation was rendered still more intolerable by the Act of 1712, passed in spite of the Kirk during the Tory ascendancy of the reign of Queen Anne, which restored the right of presentation to the private patrons, who had exercised it before the Revolution.

Though some of these Acts are subsequent to the first meeting of the Assembly in 1690, they may nevertheless all be taken as representing the conditions and limitations under which it was summoned. William, who feared the enthusiasm of Presbyterianism, no less than did the Stewarts, gave to Scotland the appearance, but not the reality, of the system established by Knox and Melville. If Charles had failed to crush its head, William would seek to render it harmless by drawing its sting. The latter experiment has been attended with a certain measure of success. But who that has entered into the spirit of the Scottish Reformation, who that knows anything of the peculiar genius of the Scottish race, could suppose that the channel prepared by the tolerant statecraft of the Revolution was wide or deep enough to hold that masterful tide of religious life which took its rise in the fervid preaching of John Knox? The Cameronians, who in spite of their narrow vision and exaggerated claims inherited more of the ideal of the sixteenth century than those who were content with the accommodation provided by 'the cautious, wise, and liberal Carstares,' turned sullenly away from the Revolution Settlement; and their faded banner, with its motto 'For Christ's Crown and Covenant,' has been consigned with the tattered remnants of the standard of the Stewarts to the limbo of those lost but not forgotten causes which defeat has touched with a posthumous romance. But cold and to all appearance dead though the Scottish Establishment became under the blighting influence of a spirit to which in after times the sinister epithet of Moderate was attached, the past was never forgotten, the fire never died out; the spark only awaited the kindling influence of a reawakened evangelical zeal to burst into flame. Though the Kirk as constituted by the Revolution Settlement was not the Church of John Knox, there were elements that

temporarily found their home within it which drew their inspiration directly from that source.

The course of our argument now brings us to the more immediate causes which produced those successive ruptures by which Presbyterianism in Scotland has been enabled to develop on a broader basis than the limits of the Establishment would allow. For this purpose it is necessary to retrace our steps in order to consider one of the factors in the post-Reformation history of Scotland that exercised a decisive influence upon the development of ecclesiastical affairs. We have said that patronage, as settled by the Act of 1712, was the battleground of the parties which are now represented by the two great divisions of Scottish Presbyterianism. The measure was conceived by the Tories in the interests of the landed proprietors. Of all countries perhaps there is none that has less cause to be proud of its old aristocracy than Scotland. Conspicuous in romance, the contribution of this order to the true greatness of the country has been insignificant in comparison with the service rendered by the middle class, which was the child of the Reformation. Though their aid was doubtless necessary to the establishment of the reformed Kirk, the nobles, from the time when they refused the *First Book of Discipline* and prevented the accomplishment of Knox's magnificent scheme for the appropriation of the old ecclesiastical revenues, began to exercise a sinister influence upon religion in Scotland. There is one simple key to their unstable policy, and that is covetousness. Half of the land throughout the country belonged to the ancient hierarchy. The nobles coveted the Kirk lands. Therefore they supported the Reformation. They had no wish to see those lands slip through their fingers. Therefore they opposed John Knox in the matter of the patrimony of the Kirk. To be rebuked for their vices by a set of plebeian preachers living upon rents which they had a mind to put into their own pockets, was not to their taste. Having got the lands into their own hands on the express stipulation that they should be liable for the support of the reformed ministry, the maintenance of education, and the relief of the poor, they proceeded to starve all three. And inasmuch as the right of patronage afforded a much better opportunity for sweating the Kirk than the system of Knox's *Book of Discipline* which expressly provides for the election of ministers by the congregation, it is not surprising that the book was rejected by the nobles, and that an Act of the Scots Parliament so early as 1567 reserves the

'pres
patro

I

princ

matte

Refor

asser

1649

patro

to th

broug

rights

reduc

to ge

favour

Those

not wi

what

bishop

for p

that s

last o

that n

he w

Dunk

TH

Charl

rary f

for th

all gra

ground

perform

were i

restitu

parsim

succee

Parlian

portion

system

to acc

succee

post-R

with th

restless

estate,

VOL.

'presentation of laic patronages' to 'the just and ancient patrons.'

Thus it will be seen that the struggle between the principles of the Kirk and the interests of the lairds in the matter of presentation to benefices carries us right back to Reformation days. The General Assembly was unable to assert its freedom until the times of the Covenant, but in 1649 it was enacted by the supreme court of the Kirk that patronage should be vested in the Kirk-Session, with an appeal to the presbytery. The Rescissory Act of 1661, which brought back Episcopacy, restored as a matter of course the rights of patrons. For this and other reasons, all ultimately reducible to the argument of greed, the nobles, though glad to get quit of the older prelacy, were for the most part favourable to the royal policy of reimposing the hierarchy. Those who were, in Hooker's words, 'although peradventure not willing to be yoked with elderships, yet contended (for what intent God doth know) to uphold opposition against bishops,' were ready enough to recognize their true affinity for prelacy when the period of destruction was past. Even that stout Presbyterian, Lord Crawford, could not see the last of Episcopacy in 1689 without a sigh. 'The bishoprics that my father had right to,' he said, 'were many; but those he was possessed of were only Caithness, Ross, Murray, Dunkeld, and Dunblane.'

There was, however, one memorable occasion on which Charles I. roused the loyal heritors of Scotland into a temporary fervour of Presbyterianism. This was, when in his zeal for the Kirk he issued the famous 'decreits arbitral' revoking all grants by the Crown, including the teinds, or tithes, on the ground that the Kirk lands and teinds were attached to the performance of ecclesiastical functions of which laymen were incapable. Though not strong enough to enforce this restitution, the demand for which had been provoked by the parsimony of the lay impropiators, the king nevertheless succeeded in wringing from the reluctant nobles an Act of Parliament, which at least compelled them to discharge a portion of their duty. This Act of 1633 still regulates the system of teinds in Scotland, and to understand it is at once to account for the determination with which the heritors succeeded in retaining for themselves the patronage of the post-Revolution Church, and exercised it for the most part with the avowed object of smothering zeal and checking all restless activity. Briefly the arrangement is as follows. An estate, the annual rental of which at the passage of the Act

amounted to 10,000*l.*, was liable for teind to the extent of about 1,000*l.* It has never actually paid the full amount, but the Court of Teinds, representing the Crown, has power within that limit to fix the stipend of the parish minister, and, if it think fit, to augment it on the application of the incumbent at intervals of twenty years from the date of his induction. The balance, which has not yet been called up, is called the unexhausted teind, and it is estimated that one-fifth of the whole amount, or about 130,000*l.*, is still retained by the landlords. This being the case, it requires no great gift of imagination to see why the nobility and gentry of Scotland, even though they might be Episcopalians, clung tenaciously to that control over the character of the Kirk which patronage gave them; why they refused to rest until its partial loss in 1690 was repaired by the Act of 1712. But for that century of all but undisturbed repose under the peaceful sway of the Moderates, it is probable that not one penny of teind would at the present day remain to the heritors. And it is quite conceivable that had the General Assembly been swayed by a Thomas Chalmers in 1742 instead of 1842, his zeal for the extension of the Church to meet the needs of a growing population would have ended, not in the Disruption, but in the restoration to the service of religion of that ancient patrimony which, with no good will on the part of Knox, had found its way into the pockets of the aristocracy.

Such were the causes which prevented from the very first the Assembly of the Established Church of Scotland from being in any true sense of the word free. Only sixty of the four hundred ministers 'outed' in 1661 remained to form the nucleus of the reconstituted Kirk. These, with three Cameronian ministers, who without their flocks came over to the Establishment, brought with them principles which ever remained as a tradition, but which were powerless to assert themselves against the limitations imposed by law, the counsels of the High Commissioner, the leadership of 'the cautious, wise, and liberal' Carstares, and the dead weight of what soon became the prevalent majority. For this Presbyterian remnant was soon joined by some three hundred Episcopal incumbents, who were quite ready to turn their coats to save their stipends, and by the patrons' nominees, who were inducted in the room of the rabbled curates. A body so constituted was not likely to express that fervent spirit which was the soul of the Reformation. The average parish minister was a harmless scholar, like Josiah Cargill in

St.
was
poc
in h
disc
devo
take
Carl
of L
idea
flam
seve
and
'Car
sible
Not
pulp
rule
own
evan
of th
his d
Bible
Asser
to pa
the K
Divin
had,
which
or cri
B
fact w
forget
giving
could
popul
the fa
impla
felt hi
the R
daily
about
hinds
force
herito

St. Ronan's Well, or a tolerant, good-natured gentleman, who was a good companion for the laird, and troubled neither his pocket nor his conscience. The statement of Dr. Chalmers, in his unregenerate youth, that an incumbent, after the due discharge of his parochial duties, had five spare days to devote to other pursuits, represents the view of their office taken by the best ministers of a leisured age. Alexander Carlyle, of Inveresk, and John Home, who wrote the tragedy of *Douglas*, represent a type far enough removed from the ideals of the Reformation epoch. Every effort to kindle a flame of evangelical zeal among the common people was severely repressed by a majority which dined with the laird and read moral essays to his tenants. Upheavals like the 'Cambuslang wark,' for which George Whitefield was responsible, incurred the displeasure of the decorous Moderates. Not only were wandering strangers refused the use of the pulpits of the Establishment, but the curiously intolerant rule which prevented ministers from preaching outside their own parishes was expressly designed to check the growth of evangelical religion. And even so late as 1796, when Erskine, of the Greyfriars, attempted, in a speech rendered famous by his dramatic appeal to the chair—'Moderator, rax me that Bible'—to awaken a conscience among the members of Assembly on the subject of foreign missions, they were content to pass from the subject by a resolution which only pledged the Kirk to avail itself of 'any favourable opportunity which Divine Providence might hereafter open.' The landowners had, indeed, got an Establishment after their own hearts, which would not arouse them when they slept in its pews, or criticize their attendance at the Episcopal chapel.

But the Scottish aristocracy is not Scotland. That is a fact which the readers of romance are sometimes tempted to forget. Government might think to pacify the country by giving it a church organized upon a popular method, but it could not repress the twofold sentiment of religious zeal and popular freedom, which, though it ran an eccentric course in the fanatical outburst of the Covenanters, had been deeply implanted in the breast of every common Scottish man, who felt himself ennobled as the spiritual son of John Knox and the Reformation. The Lowland shepherd, as he took his daily road across the hills; the cottar, gathering his family about him for the worship of God on Saturday night; the very hinds, as they wandered in byre and steading, represented a force which must sooner or later come into conflict with heritors and presbyteries: and to them the settlement of

the 'cautious, wise, and liberal' Carstares was but a sorry substitute for the glorious liberty of the children of God. Nor, as we have said, were the traditions of an earlier age unrepresented even in the ranks of the ministry. A free General Assembly still lingered as an ideal, and the conflicts which resulted in secession were based upon the ground that the Kirk, acting through its legitimate organs, from the congregation up to the Assembly itself, was free, and that any attempt at coercion on the part of a representative of the civil power, be it patron or court of law, was a violation of its fundamental principle. Neither disagreement with the principle of an establishment nor the rejection of endowments was the cause of the repeated exodus from the Established Church of Scotland. It was the maintenance of that principle which was firmly rooted in the Scottish Reformation, that the Word of God is free, and that the civil magistrate has no more right to regard the National Church as a State department of religion than has the Pope to arrogate to himself a universal dominion.

The protest, which is now represented in formidable proportions by the United Free Church, was not long in finding its first utterance. There lies before us, as we write, an old book entitled *An Illustration of the Doctrines of the Christian Religion*, which, as the editor asserts in the preface, elevates its author 'above the false imputation of Antinomianism or the scourge of the Arminian's tongue.' The volume recalls the plain little kirk of Ettrick, in which its contents were delivered as sermons in the earlier years of the eighteenth century to crowds of simple country-folk who assembled not only from up and down the vale of Ettrick itself, but from Yarrow, and Moffat Water, and the distant Eskdalemuir. The preacher was one whose name is well known in the history of religious literature, Thomas Boston, author of *The Fourfold State*. He lived and died minister of Ettrick, and his body rests in the kirkyard. But, though he never left the Establishment, he was the first of the 'Marrowmen,' and, as such, represented a doctrine which was highly offensive to the moderatism of the General Assembly. It was he who discovered in a cottage the work of an English Puritan, entitled the *Marrow of Modern Divinity*, introduced into Scotland, so it is said, in the knapsack of one of Cromwell's soldiers. The fervour which this treatise rekindled in Scotland has been said by the late Principal Tulloch to represent 'the survival of the spirit of doctrinal enthusiasm.' That criticism seems to us to rest upon an utter misunder-

standing of the forces which still operate in the religious life of Scotland, which always has been highly susceptible of the evangelical appeal. The Marrow controversy arose out of no mere survival. The movement, which is associated with the name of Boston, and the more immediate result of which was the Original Secession of 1733, was the initial stage of that great separation which culminated in the events of 1843. It was the evangelical spirit of the Reformation, cribbed, cabined, and confined within the strait borders of the Establishment, seeking a larger room.

The *Marrow* was condemned by the Assembly in 1720. In the following year its principal upholders, prominent among whom was Ebenezer Erskine, received the censure of the House. It was at this point, when the tension of parties had been emphasized by these formal proceedings, that the Assembly precipitated a rupture by enacting that, in case of the failure of patrons to present to vacant benefices, the Act of 1690, which provided for election by elders and heritors, should be regarded as coming into force. Here let it be remembered that Erskine was the son of an 'outed' incumbent, who in the days of the Protectorate had been minister of Cornhill, in Northumberland, and both his evangelical temper and his attitude towards patronage are traced to their origin. The strain, which represented the old Reformation ideals, was still present in the Kirk. It was to Erskine's sermon, in 1732, before the Synod of Perth and Stirling, denouncing the Assembly for a betrayal of its trust in the matter of patronage, that the secession was directly due, to which finality was given in 1740 by the deposition, now inevitable, of Erskine and his associate ministers.

The year 1752 witnessed the deposition of Thomas Gillespie, whose parents had been connected with the original Seceders, and whose education had been carried on under the influence of Philip Doddridge and the English Dissenters at Northampton. He was parish minister of Charnock, in Fife, and belonged to the presbytery of Dunfermline. With five other members of that presbytery he incurred the censure of the Assembly for refusing to induct a presentee to the living of Inverkeithing against the will of the congregation. Thus in a more acute form the question of patronage was once more raised, and the body which rallied round Gillespie, when by an arbitrary and unjust selection he was singled out for deposition, justified itself on the ground that it offered 'relief' to those who were oppressed by the evil influences of patronage.

Such were the beginnings of what became rather more than fifty years ago the United Presbyterian Church. It was the protest of a small minority, and could not have been anything else. It is true that the societies then formed grew at a comparatively rapid rate, and that as early as 1765 the progress of Dissent aroused a feeling of uneasiness in the Establishment. But the Secession and Relief congregations, though they began to spread themselves over the greater part of Scotland, were, after all, only caves of Adullam, whither resorted every one that was discontented with the parish church. So long as the General Assembly continued to register by its acts the wishes of the civil power, it was impossible to bring the controversy between Presbyterian ideals and the Revolution Settlement to anything resembling a decisive test. And at the present day, if no further breach had been made in the walls of the Establishment, the numbers of the seceders, though in themselves not inconsiderable, would yet by comparison have appeared so small as to suggest that, after all, the aspirations of the people of Scotland were sufficiently satisfied by the Revolution Kirk.

But the witness of the Disruption is decisive. That great event, to which there is nothing even remotely to compare in the religious history of England; which carried, if not the majority, at least the greatest and the best of the ministers of the Church of Scotland outside its communion; which divided households and severed friendships; which gave to the nineteenth century an example of sacrifice in the cause of religion so splendid, that Lord Jeffrey, the celebrated reviewer, on learning what had occurred, broke out with the words, 'I am proud of my country!' That event has served to reveal to the unprejudiced observer that, not the development of novel doctrines, but the failure of the Kirk to represent and contain the old Presbyterianism of Scotland, is the true cause of the great schism which at this day divides the religious life of the country. It may be true—it doubtless is true—that the experience of life and work outside the borders of the Establishment has developed among those who originally had no quarrel with its main principle, a decided preference for an organization free from what is now called State control, and a certain resentment against the less heroic body which continues to bask in the sunlight of State patronage. But sentiments such as these do not issue in secession; it is of secession that they are the all but inevitable sequence. The event which issued in the birth of the Free Church, springing full grown out of the Establishment, like Athena from the brain of

Zeus, carrying with it the full organization, the forms, the very motto and symbol of the older society, may technically be a secession ; but it is rightly represented by the name of the Disruption. However numerous in the aggregate our English Dissenters may be, it cannot be said that their existence seriously impairs the substantial identity of the Church of England. The same cannot be said of the Presbyterian Church in Scotland. The secessions of the eighteenth century represented a claim on behalf of the Church, the validity of which could not be tested because of the subservience of the General Assembly. But the steady advance of Evangelicalism completely changed the face of the Church. In the Assembly of 1834 the Moderates were no longer in the ascendant. Men who inherited the fire of the Reformation, and whose spirit was not altogether alien to that of the Covenanters, were determined to fight the battle of the Kirk against the tyranny of the secular power. The point on which the issue was raised was the old grievance of patronage, the right of the State to compel presbyteries to intrude the nominees of patrons upon unwilling congregations. The leaders in the great strife appear not as party chiefs, but as champions of the General Assembly. Dr. Charteris, in his *Life of Dr. James Robertson, of Ellon*, has endeavoured to modify the popular verdict, and to show that on that memorable May morning the half-empty benches of St. Andrew's Church, after the Moderator and his distinguished following had passed out on his way to the hall at Canonmills, still held a company of men not unworthy to be compared with those who had quitted them for ever. We are not prepared to describe them, in the somewhat unworthy phrase of their opponents, as 'the Residuum,' but no more can we believe that they were the equals of Candlish, Guthrie, Cunningham, and above all Chalmers, who after the death of Sir Walter Scott was not improbably the greatest living Scotsman. These were the representatives of the Assembly. During those ten years of conflict, in which the future was still undecided, it was for what they claimed as the just rights of the Church of Scotland that they fought. Their opponents were not the General Assembly, but the civil courts. When at length they found that these courts were inexorable, and that the House of Lords itself decided in favour of an interpretation of the Revolution Settlement such as that given by President Hope, which, in the true spirit of John Knox, they regarded as inconsistent with the honour of our Lord Jesus Christ as Head of the Church ; when, further,

they had sought the aid of Parliament in vain, and redress of an intolerable grievance seemed impossible, the question that presented itself to their minds was not 'What is our duty?' but 'What is the duty of the Church of Scotland?' Their decision was not that they personally were bound to secede, but that the Church of Scotland was bound to free itself by a refusal to accept State recognition on the only terms that the State was prepared to give. The event was unique. It has no parallel to which we can appeal. The alternative was now seen to be a mutilated Presbyterianism with State recognition, as against a full Presbyterianism without that support. We do not seek to justify the Free Church. We are not prepared to say that a policy of patience might not ultimately have vindicated the fundamental principle of the Scottish Reformation, a free General Assembly, without the pain of separation and the forfeiture of national establishment. But the discussion would be purely academical. We do not doubt that in its subsequent history the Established Church, retaining as it has done the allegiance of half of the Presbyterians, if not of the whole population of Scotland, and profiting in many ways both from the experience of the Disruption and from the antagonism of its formidable rival, has achieved in practice, if not in theory, especially since the abolition of patronage in 1874, a large measure of that independence which the fathers of the Free Church claimed. But no philosophic view of the Kirk can regard it as now existing otherwise than in a broken unity. Nor in the future reconstruction of Scottish Presbyterianism can union be accomplished by a return of the United Free Church to the Establishment on the basis of the existing relations with the State. We do not mean to imply that a comprehensive Presbyterian Church can only be reached on the lines of such a measure of disestablishment as ten, or even five, years ago might have seemed the only possible course. But we are certain that, unless the Church history of Scotland can be rewritten, the United Free Church rests upon a basis that is absolutely secure, and that the real chasm in Scottish ecclesiastical life—that, namely, which divides the established and non-established Presbyterians—can only be effectively bridged by a full and frank recognition of the principles for which Erskine and Gillespie, Chalmers, Candlish, and Guthrie were content to sacrifice stipend, manse, and worldly advancement. A policy of relaxation, like that of the Conservative Government of 1874, which sought in the very temper of the Revolution to substitute one State-made system

of patronage for another in order to conciliate the alienated Dissenter, shows a singular lack of appreciation in estimating the necessities of the situation. But a genuine reconstruction on a wider basis there assuredly must be, if the requirements of the Scottish Reformation are to be satisfied. The formation of the pastoral tie, which according to the Presbyterian system includes the right of ordination, must be left entirely within the control of the Church. The ecclesiastical courts, of which the highest is the General Assembly, must be freed from all semblance of exercising an authority derived from statutes of the realm. Beyond the right, which is fully conceded even by the most high-flying Free Churchman, to take cognizance of all cases that affect the common civil rights of the citizen, the interference of the civil courts in spiritual affairs must be definitely rejected.

There are not wanting signs within the Establishment of a movement in the direction here indicated. Not only in the Assembly of 1901 were words of brotherly congratulation addressed to the neighbouring Church on the recent consummation of its union; not only did the Moderator suggest co-operation on the lines which have already produced a hymn book for both Presbyterian Churches, such, for example, as a union in the education of divinity students and in foreign mission work, thus producing 'that union of hearts which is the best preparation for a final union of Churches'; but some of the utterances of the speakers in this year's debates are specially worthy of attention. We will select the words of Dr. Scott, one of the ablest and most trusted leaders of the House:

"If," he said, "a union of Presbyterian Churches in Scotland were consummated, I must say—and all of us must say—that legislation of some kind would be needed to adapt the existing relations to the greatly altered circumstances. What form that legislation would assume we cannot predict; but surely out of the deliberations of the Presbyterian Churches of Scotland there would come some readjustment of the present relations which would secure all you and I contend for, and that is, that the glorious Being whom both Churches adore as the Head of the Church shall also be adored by the nation, that those religious endowments which have come down as the fruit of voluntary gifts . . . should be conserved and used for the purposes for which they were given."

If words like these are indications of the tendencies towards union which are working within the Establishment, we may perceive in the other communion also a change of attitude corresponding to this spirit of concession. Free

Churchmen are not the keen controversialists they once were, in the days when at kirk, at market, and at fair, nought was heard but of Non-Intrusion and the rights of congregations. The air is no longer electric with Disestablishment as in the days of the Midlothian campaign. The recent union has necessarily softened the edges of the voluntary principle. And even though Dr. Rainy, to whose persistent efforts, perhaps more than to any other immediate cause, the United Free Church owes its existence, expressed in his Moderator's address his own hope that the larger Presbyterian union, when it comes, will be 'free from the temptations and the risks of a statutory connexion with the State,' it is perhaps permissible to emphasize rather his generous acknowledgment of the necessity of union conveyed in the words, 'we own that without them we cannot be made perfect.' It is for a union that shall heal the deplorable breach in the Presbyterianism of Scotland without sacrificing principles dear to either party that we at least may be permitted to hope.

For though, as we have endeavoured to show, it is 'the right of the Church to interpret, to determine its own constitution, its own principles, its own doctrines'—in other words, a free General Assembly, which is the central feature of the Scottish Reformation—it cannot be denied that the national Zion belongs to the ideals of that period, and that the Established Church occupies a place both in the affections of the Scottish people and the life of the Scottish nation that no other society can expect to fill. To remove it would, in spite of its imperfections, involve the loss of a witness to Scottish independence, of a landmark among Scottish institutions, of a symbol of Scottish faith. No Scotsman, whatever his religious belief, could stand unmoved in the Tolbooth Church at the close of the General Assembly, when after the dissolution, first by the Moderator 'in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, the sole King and Head of the Church,' then by the High Commissioner 'on behalf of his Majesty the King,' the fathers and brethren join in the metrical version of the one hundred and twenty-second psalm. It is a simple pageant, but Scotland is in it. It preserves an ideal, which may become a fact sooner than this generation knows. Meantime, in preparation for that yet larger union for which our prayers ever ascend, we of the Church of England shall do well to read for ourselves the lessons that are writ large upon the chequered pages of the history of religion in Scotland.

ART. VIII.—THE ALFRED LITERATURE AND
COMMEMORATION.

1. *Alfred the Great.* Containing Chapters on his Life and Times. By various Authors. Edited, with Preface, by ALFRED BOWKER, Mayor of Winchester. (London, 1899.)
2. *Alfred the Great, King and Patriot Saint of England.* A Sermon preached in Winchester Cathedral on Sunday, June 23, 1901, at the Summer Assembly of the National Home Reading Union. By the Very Rev. C. W. STUBBS, D.D., Dean of Ely. (Winchester, 1901.)
3. *King Alfred the Great.* By MONTAGU BURROWS, M.A., R.N., Chichele Professor of Modern History. (London, 1898.)
4. *The Writings of King Alfred.* An Address delivered at Harvard College. By FREDERIC HARRISON, M.A. (New York and London, 1901.)
5. *The Story of King Alfred.* By the late Sir WALTER BESANT. With Illustrations. (London, 1901.)
6. *Outlines of the Life and Work of King Alfred the Great.* With Map, Plans, and List of Books for further Study. By F. J. C. HEARNshaw, M.A., LL.M. (Southampton, 1901.)
7. *The Life of King Alfred.* By Dr. REINHOLD PAULI. A Translation Revised by the Author. Edited by THOMAS WRIGHT, Esq., M.A. F.S.A. (London, 1852.)
8. *Alfred le Grand.* Par GUILLAUME GUIZOT. Troisième Edition. (Paris, 1864.)
9. *The Life and Times of Alfred the Great.* By the Rev. J. A. GILES, D.C.L. (London, 1848.)
10. *King Alfred.* By E. PAXTON HOOD. 'Short Biographies for the People' Series. (London, no date.)
11. *The Millenary of Alfred the Great, Warrior and Saint, Scholar and King.* A Sermon by the Rev. C. L. ENGSTRÖM, M.A. (London, 1901.)
12. *Alfred the Truthteller.* A Speech by Lord Rosebery. (London, 1901.)

IT is our happy privilege, as well as a serious duty, to take part, by an article in these pages, in the Commemoration of Alfred. The materials are abundant; they have been carefully sifted by competent scholars; facts and tales and the

more doubtful legends have been accurately classified ; and, at all events for scholars, the outline of the Great King's life is clearly defined. So much excellent literature has been produced upon this illustrious reign, and it is so well known to historical students, that, after making some remarks upon it and upon the original documents on which it is based, we shall feel justified in aiming chiefly at the object to which a very large part of the work of the committee of the National Commemoration, of Alfred has been devoted—to help to diffuse, as widely as possible, public knowledge of the King's life and work. We should be glad to think that the *Church Quarterly Review* had taken a characteristic part in making that great figure of Alfred more vividly present before the eyes of the English people, and in convincing them that the old Saxon Chronicle, the biography and annals of good Bishop Asser, and the later monastic compilers can tell them of a noble life which can be imitated, but can hardly be excelled, in these later days. Alfred has ever stirred and warmed the hearts of Englishmen, and it will be an ill day for England when no worship is left for such a hero as he. Hitherto, at all events, our fellow-countrymen have not been backward in the praise of Alfred. The Church, which canonized the weak Edward called 'Confessor,' did not usually call Alfred 'Saint,' though in some Kalendars he is beatified, but England called him the Truth-teller, the Shepherd, the Wisest Man in England, the Darling of the English. From Asser downwards no one praises him who does not think that he ought to be praised more. This is so, as much with the scrupulously accurate and scientific historians as with the enthusiastic Churchmen and the popular writers. Alfred's great character appeals indeed to many different Englishmen in many different ways. To some he is chiefly attractive as a warrior, to others as a scholar, to others as a statesman, to others as a king, to others as a churchman, but to all as a man.

It is obvious that we are most concerned with his work in connexion with the Church, and with education as an inseparable part of that work, but an estimate of the whole character of the man necessitates some reference to his wars and his constructive administration. All parts of his life afford illustrations of the justice of the eulogy which has been pronounced upon him, glowing as it is. We will give a few samples. Professor Freeman calls him 'the best and greatest of all our Kings,' and 'the most perfect character in history';¹

¹ See *Old English History*, p. 113; and Introduction to *History of the Norman Conquest*.

Bishop Lightfoot says that he is 'the greatest and best of English Kings';¹ Dr. Bright considers him to be 'the noblest example of old English Christianity,' and says that in reading of Oswald 'we think instinctively of Alfred,' and he places Oswald, Alfred, and St. Louis together as royal examples of 'personal piety';² Professor Burrows at the close of his address remarks that 'on the whole we seem to be for once in history handling what the great Greek philosopher called a "four-square man." The winds of adversity did not chill him, the sun of prosperity did not melt him. He stood four-square against the winds of heaven.' And, as he truly adds, this is 'an elevating, ennobling study.'³ The Dean of Ely enlarges upon Professor Freeman's panegyric, and says that 'it is the moral grandeur of Alfred's character that still hallows his memory among us.'⁴ Sir Walter Besant calls him 'the typical man of our race at his best and noblest.'⁵ Mr. Frederic Harrison, generously described by Mr. Bowker as the 'virtual originator' of the Commemoration,⁶ in his Harvard address speaks of Alfred as 'the real father of native prose,' and in Mr. Bowker's book he says that Alfred's record is 'without stain and without weakness,' and that he is 'equally amongst the greatest of men in genius, in magnanimity, in valour, in moral purity, in intellectual force, in practical wisdom, and in beauty of soul. In his recorded career from infancy to death we can find no single trait that is not noble and suggestive, nor a single act or word that can be counted as a flaw.'⁷ Mr. Bowker himself (p. 12) says that Alfred 'may rightly be regarded as one of the principal founders of the English nation and its language, a pioneer of improvement, liberty, learning, and education, who, though a thousand years have sped, still forms a mighty beacon of all the highest aims and the noblest aspirations that may dominate the hearts of men.' The Bishop of

¹ *Galatians*, p. 190.

² *Chapters of Early English Church History*, pp. 152, 163, 371. He notes (p. 296) that we owe to Alfred the beautiful story about St. Aldhelm's blameless guile on the bridge at Malmesbury when he gathered a crowd of listeners by minstrelsy and then passed to serious thoughts, and also that Asser, 'the Welsh counsellor and biographer of Alfred,' was Aldhelm's most noteworthy successor at Sherborne (p. 472).

³ *King Alfred the Great*, pp. 28-9.

⁴ *Alfred the Great*, p. 8.

⁵ *The Story of King Alfred*, p. 206; and in the Introduction (p. 37) to Mr. Bowker's *Alfred the Great*.

⁶ *Times*, September 19.

⁷ *The Writings of King Alfred*, p. 3; Bowker's *Alfred the Great*, pp. 41-2.

Bristol, in an interesting communication to the *Guardian*, that may well be read in connexion with his article in Mr. Bowker's book, describes Alfred as 'the happy fruit and fruitful parent of religious education.'¹ Mr. Oman, who deals with Alfred as a warrior, summarizes this aspect of his career by saying that he 'had turned defeat into victory, brought order out of chaos, and left the torn and riven kingdom that he had inherited, transformed into the best organised and most powerful state in Western Europe.'² Sir Clements Markham, in a brief paper on Alfred as a geographer, not only hails 'him as one who stands alone and unrivalled—the founder of the science of geography in this country,' but makes the further-reaching statement that his 'single-minded devotion . . . to the service of his people is shown in every action of his life.'³ Professor Earle, whose recent monograph on the King's Jewel may be consulted by the antiquarian and the student of the Alfred literature,⁴ uses weighty words, on a subject on which his authority will not be questioned, when he says that it is due to Alfred's 'installation of the mother tongue as the medium of elementary teaching' that 'we alone of all European nations have a fine vernacular literature in the ninth and tenth and eleventh centuries'; and he records his opinion that the domestic culture of that era 'was the cause why the great French immigration which followed in the wake of the Norman Conquest did not finally swamp the English language.'⁵ Sir Frederick Pollock, who is understood to have a work in preparation to which the chapter on English Law before the Norman Conquest in Mr. Bowker's book belongs,⁶ and who recently gave an interesting lecture at Oxford on the 'doubtful incidents' and 'legendary additions' which have found their way into the historical company of the records of Alfred,⁷ tells us that 'we owe it to the work of Alfred and his children that England was saved to become an individual nation, and that our fundamental ideas of justice have survived all external changes.' These principles, of which he gives an admirable epitome, appear, he says, 'obvious to most of us, but there are many civilized countries

¹ *The Guardian*, July 3, 1901, p. 909.

² Mr. Bowker's *Alfred the Great*, p. 148.

³ *Ibid.* pp. 151, 167.

⁴ *The Alfred Jewel*. By Professor Earle. (Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1901.)

⁵ Mr. Bowker's *Alfred the Great*, p. 205.

⁶ *Ibid.* p. 209.

⁷ See the *Times* report, August 13, 1901.

where they are not admitted.'¹ The Rev. W. J. Loftie, who discusses Alfred's relation to the fine arts, is able to make a triple division of his subject and say that the King was 'an architect, a writer, and a musician.'² Dr. Milner, the Roman Catholic historian of Winchester, opens his treatment of the reign of Alfred by saying that 'we come now to speak of the miracle of history: a prince, who, having been the subject of innumerable pens, has never had a defect imputed to him as a sovereign, nor a fault as a man. This was the immortal Alfred.'³ The Poet-Laureate, who has already, in the 'dedication' of *England's Darling*, called Alfred 'the greatest of Englishmen,' contributes some stanzas on 'the spotless King' to Mr. Bowker's book in further praise of him. Ruskin places Alfred beside Henry of Germany and Charlemagne as typically representative of 'the justice of humanity, gradually forming the feudal system out of the ruined elements of Roman luxury and law.'⁴ Mr. Hunt has recently said that 'no King has left behind him so lofty and stainless a record,' and 'his noble memory is dear to English hearts.'⁵ Wordsworth devotes an ecclesiastical sonnet to 'the pious Alfred, King to Justice dear, Lord of the harp and liberating spear, Mirror of princes.' He speaks of his 'great soul'; he calls him the 'Darling of England,' and the 'rich theme of England's fondest praise.'⁶ Mr. Churton, in his chapter on the reign of Alfred, used of him the words in which Keble described St. Louis⁷:

'Where shall the holy cross find rest?

On a crowned monarch's mailed breast:

Like some bright angel o'er the darkling scene

'Through court and camp he holds his heavenward course serene.'⁸

Mr. Paxton Hood in his excellent penny *Life of King Alfred*, in the series of 'Short Biographies for the People,' quotes from Gibbon the truly characteristic pronouncement, 'Amidst the deepest darkness of barbarism, the virtues of Antoninus, the learning and valour of a Cæsar, and the

¹ Mr. Bowker's *Alfred the Great*, p. 239.

² *Ibid.* p. 243.

³ Milner's *History and Survey of the Antiquities of Winchester*, i. 95 (third edition).

⁴ *Fors Clavigera*, vol. i. Letter 15.

⁵ *A History of the English Church*, from its foundation to the Norman Conquest, pp. 287-8.

⁶ *The Poetical Works of William Wordsworth* (edited by W. M. Rossetti), pp. 253, 301.

⁷ *The Early English Church*.

⁸ *The Christian Year*, First Sunday in Advent.

legislative spirit of a Lycurgus were manifested in this patriotic King.¹

These are but typical selections from the chorus of praise, and before we inquire further into the actions and the character of the man about whom all this is said, or ask what deductions, if any, are to be made from it, we must make some remarks on the original authorities from which our information is derived, and upon some of the later literature to which the fontal documents have given rise.

In the first place, there is of course the Chronicle, 'sometimes called the Saxon Chronicle, sometimes the Anglo-Saxon, and nowadays more generally the English Chronicle.'² There is some difficulty in determining how much actual share Alfred had in the compilation of this document, but on the smallest computation our debt to him is very large, and the Chronicle holds the prime place of authority unchallenged. There is no doubt that Alfred began this work, and his share in it was certainly great. The basis for the earlier part of it was probably found in short local chronicles written in English, in Bede's work, and in national traditions. Begun about the year 890, it was continued, with more or less fulness and regularity and with extraordinary accuracy, until 1154; and from the death of Bede in 735 until the work of the last Chronicler ceased at Peterborough 'it is the highest narrative authority for English history, and forms a record, the like of which cannot be found in the early vernacular literature of any other people.'³ Its special importance for the reign of Alfred, which Sir Walter Besant mentions in his popularly written *Story* (p. 17), is of course derived from the fact that in the year 855 it becomes virtually contemporary. Professor Burrows speaks not only of the 'accurate care' but also of the 'vigorous lofty style' of the Chronicle (p. 26), and justly so, even if it be true, as Sir Walter Besant says, that 'the work is, for the most part, what it purports to be, a mere chronicle, without much comment, of the principal events in each year, often losing, as is the way with such chronicles, the proportion of things, keeping silence where we most desire information, and narrating things with which we are not concerned.'⁴ But we may think that this hardly does justice to the fuller story of Alfred's own reign, 'written with a vigour and a freshness and a life worthy of the temper and

¹ p. 2.

² So Professor Burrows, p. 26.

³ Hunt's *English Church*, p. 282.

⁴ Sir W. Besant's *Story*, pp. 17-8.

spirit of a King whose deeds they record.'¹ Mr. Harrison's comment is that the Chronicle is 'the most authentic and important record of its youth which any modern nation possesses,' that 'for the most important years of Alfred's reign it is very full and keenly interesting,' and that 'no error of the least importance has ever been proven' against it (p. 8). To say this will not seem to say too much to the reader who remembers Professor Freeman's words, 'I always take care never to contradict the Chronicle, even when I bring in details from other sources.'² When we seek for the names of those who assisted Alfred in the compilation of the Chronicle, or who compiled it under his direction, we find that Mercia supplied him with the assistance of some learned priests, and that Plegmund, who for fear of the Danes had lived as a hermit on an island near Chester, and became Archbishop of Canterbury in 890, was at his right hand. As for the place of the composition of the Chronicle, or, as we ought perhaps more accurately to say, the weaving of the materials which form it into one record, the alternative name of 'the book of Winton' is sufficient to connect it with the capital of Wessex, so inseparably bound up with Alfred's reign, and ever to be honoured as his earthly resting-place. Professor Freeman speaks very cautiously, saying that 'there seems some reason to think that the Chronicle began to be put together in its present shape in Alfred's time.'³ This is enough to justify us in saying that the Chronicle 'is a noble monument of the sovereign who . . . may at least be reckoned as one of the very earliest masters of the schools of history' (Burrows, p. 26), and that by giving 'the most powerful stimulus to the compilation of the record' the King was 'the founder of a systematic history of our country' (Harrison, p. 8). To these comments we need only add the testimony of Mr. J. R. Green, who in the heading of his section on Wessex and the Danes thinks that 'it is probable' that earlier materials 'were thrown together, and perhaps translated from Latin into English' in Alfred's time, and in the text of that section says more definitely that 'it seems likely that the King's rendering of Bæda's history gave the first impulse towards the compilation' of the Chronicle, 'which was certainly thrown into its present form during his reign.' When it reaches the reign of Alfred the Chronicle 'suddenly widens into the vigorous narrative, full of life and originality, that marks the gift of a new power to the English tongue.

¹ Dean Stubbs's *Sermon*, p. 4.² *Old English History*, p. 112.³ *Ibid.* p. 132.

Varying as it does from age to age in historic value, it remains the first vernacular history of any Teutonic people, the earliest and most venerable monument of Teutonic prose.¹

There is less agreement among writers as to the value of the *Life of Alfred* which bears the name of Asser, a work which at any rate stands second only to the Chronicle in the study of the King's reign. The biography has been subjected to the critical processes of modern historical study; and, after all obvious interpolations have been struck out and all doubtful passages and internal discrepancies have been set aside, the residue is probably contemporary, or, at any rate, founded on contemporary authority. If we could be sure that this *Life of Alfred* was 'really written by Asser,' this would be, says Professor Freeman, 'among our best authorities for these times. But it seems hardly possible that all of it can have been written by Asser, because it contains some things which there seems hardly any way of piecing on to the real history.'² And again, 'we cannot put the same trust in the book called Asser as we do in the Chronicle.'³ It is unfortunate that Sir Walter Besant's *Story* rather implies that this order of merit is to be reversed. Professor Burrows also seems disposed to think highly of Asser. Some, he says, 'have attempted to discredit the authenticity of Bishop Asser's account of King Alfred, but not very successfully' (p. 8, note). Asser, who was first a priest and monk of St. David's, and then Bishop of Sherborne, was engaged on the *Life*, according to his own statement, in 894. He died possibly in 909, and certainly after 904. The controversy about the integrity and value of his work has raged for a good long time, and the question may be said now to have been as much thrashed out as it can be. The details of the matter have been pretty fully discussed by Mr. Thomas Wright⁴ adversely, and by Dr. Pauli favourably (pp. 5 *sqq.* of the Introduction). Mr. Hunt describes very well the present attitude of historical students towards Asser. 'While there can be little doubt that Asser wrote the King's *Life*, and that much, if not all, that he wrote has come down to us, the book, as we have it, contains many interpolations and inconsistencies.' Some of these 'are now of no importance, because they are known to be late insertions; but

¹ *A Short History of the English People*, i. 83, 97-8 (ed. 1892).

² *Old English History*, p. 103.

³ *Ibid.* p. 104.

⁴ *Biographia Literaria Britannica*, i. 405-13; *Archæologica*, xxiv.

others are still puzzling, and it is hazardous to rely absolutely on many things which the *Life* contains.¹ But some of the chief difficulties in it are concerned with the relations between Alfred and Asser, and the matter can hardly yet be regarded as determined.

Bishop Stubbs, 'while pointing out the grave doubts that arise from the present condition of the text, is not disposed to question the general truth of the work as history, or to throw suspicion on its genuineness and authenticity.'²

When we pass from the *Chronicle* and from Asser we leave our prime authorities and come to later writers who have in various ways made use of them. Florence of Worcester, who died in 1118, does not mention Asser by name, but at any rate he made use of a document which contained much that is in Asser's *Life* as we now have it, and William of Malmesbury seems to have had a copy before him which was similar to our own. It is, to be sure, a long leap to take from Asser to Dr. Pauli, but it is significant both of the paucity and the value of intervening attempts that Green, after mentioning the *Life* by Asser, goes straight to the 'admirable modern life' by Pauli, and mentions no other. Dr. Pauli himself gives a list of books, with some comments upon them. These were two seventeenth-century works. The earlier of the two, by Robert Powell, was entitled 'The Life of Alfred or Alvred, the first institutor of subordinate government in this kingdome, and refounder of the University of Oxford, together with a parallel of our Sovereign Lord, King Charles, until this year 1634.'³ As Dr. Pauli observes, this title shows what the spirit of the work is, and what is to be learned from it. In 1678 appeared the *Aelfredi Magni Vita* of Sir John Spelman, son of the better known Sir Henry. This was an Oxford folio which was, says Dr. Pauli, 'formerly written in English'; it is mentioned by Professor Freeman in his article on Alfred in the *Dictionary of National Biography*, and Dr. Giles calls it 'old and quaint, but useful.'⁴ An eighteenth-century *Life of Alfred the Great, King of the Anglo-Saxons*, by A. Bicknell, reduced the diffuse labours of previous writers to order, but there are few signs in it of original research, and it was marked by a contempt for the Church which was

¹ *English Church*, p. 276.

² *Ibid.* p. 267, note. Mr. Hunt gives the reference to Bishop Stubbs's opinion, 'Will. of Malms. *Gesta Regum*. Pref. Vol. ii. Rolls Series.'

³ London, 1634.

⁴ *The Life and Times of Alfred the Great*, pref. p. ix.

characteristic of the time of its appearance.¹ An article on Alfred in Dr. Rees' *Cyclopædia*, a voluminous work in thirty-nine volumes, enlarges upon the campaigns and legislation of Alfred, but passes over the details of his relation to the Church almost in silence.² Dr. Giles's own book was issued in London in 1848, and has a coloured representation of King Alfred's jewel as a frontispiece. Some fifty years ago the volume in a handsome binding was considered to be an appropriate addition to the library of a country squire. Such a copy now lies before us, and it may be thought to possess more merit than Dr. Pauli allowed. In his judgment it was neither sound in criticism nor graceful in style. Certainly it is pompous, and there was a disposition on Dr. Giles's part to treat all previous writers as of more or less equal value which rouses modern critical instincts to arms. The book was really supplanted by Dr. Pauli's 'youthful work' as Freeman calls it, which was written for Germany, and was more important than another German Life by Wyss, which need not detain us. The copy which we have read and used is the earliest translation by Mr. Wright, but the work has been more recently translated again by Mr. Thorpe.³ The book is well arranged, carefully written, and a judicious estimate is formed of the leading aspects of Alfred's life. A preliminary chapter is devoted to the rise of the kingdom of the West Saxons, which must now, of course, be read in the fuller light of Freeman's chapter on the growth of Wessex,⁴ Green's sections on Wessex and the Danes and on the West Saxon Realm,⁵ and Mr. Hunt's chapters on the Viking Invasions and on Alfred.⁶ In the three succeeding chapters Dr. Pauli groups the incidents of Alfred's youth, 849 to 866; training, 866 to 871; and early trials, 871 to 881. In the second portion of the book he depicts the labours of the King in Church and State, his work as an author and an instructor, his strenuous struggle with the Danes, when, as Asser says, he rushed at the enemy like a wild boar, his family life, and his character as a man. In the appendices Dr. Pauli inserted some fragments from Alfred's writings, including his will, an account of the jewel, and a useful register of the history of Wessex from 838 to 901. In Mr. Wright's introductory description of the work he justly observes that Dr. Pauli shows 'a sort of chivalrous

¹ London, 1777.² London, 1819.³ Bohn's Library (London, 1893).⁴ *Old English History*, pp. 63-99.⁵ *A Short History*, pp. 83-117.⁶ *History*, pp. 247-288.

article on
thirty-
ation of
to the
s issued
ation of
ears ago
to be an
Such
possess
t it was
ertainly
es's part
al value
ne book
ork' as
ny, and
y Wyss,
ve have
ight, but
by Mr.
ten, and
pects of
the rise
now, of
apter on
and the
Hunt's
In the
dents of
nd early
book he
his work
gle with
emy like
an. In
ts from
e jewel,
n 838 to
he work
nivalrous

sensitiveness at the slightest incident which would intimate the possibility of casting a blot, however small, on the object of his adoration, while . . . he gives up with great reluctance even a palpable fable if it tends to enhance his glory.' M. Guizot's *Alfred le Grand*, the third edition of which appeared at Paris in 1864, is not only a survey of the life of Alfred, but consists of a series of useful chapters which fully justify the larger alternative title of *L'Angleterre sous les Anglo-Saxons*. The writer places Alfred with Gustave Wasa and Henri IV. as a king who 'a été obligé de s'ouvrir, par le travail de la guerre, le chemin du trône, son héritage' (p. 1). After a description of the reign which is similar in style and in value to the same author's treatment of Guillaume le Conquérant and Edouard III., he says, 'pour résumer plus brièvement tous les éloges d'Alfred, on pourrait se borner à rappeler les différents surnoms qu'il a reçu tour à tour : Alfred le berger de l'Angleterre, Alfred le plus sage des Anglais, Alfred le Véridique, Alfred le Grand, Alfred le Bien-Aimé' (p. 222). In strong contrast to the French narrative stands the biography of *Alfred the Great* by Thomas Hughes, which was published in 1869. As may be expected, the author of *Tom Brown's Schooldays* found that the life of Alfred was a congenial subject, and there is a bracing tone of enthusiasm in this Life which is not quite equalled by any other except by the little work of Professor Burrows, in which the reader may think that he hears the firm tread of the quarter-deck. Mr. Hughes has not confined himself to one particular aspect of Alfred's reign, but it is with Alfred as a soldier, and with his military campaigns and exploits, that he is at his best.

From this work we naturally pass to contemporary literature, much of which has been called forth by the proposal for a Millenary Commemoration of the great King. If we pass by a very good brief sketch which was written in 1895 by the Rev. F. G. A. Phillips, and was printed in *Good Will* in a series called 'Hearts of Oak,' which comprised short biographies on Bede, Cædmon, Chaucer, Grosseteste, Hugh, and others, the first place in time and in honour must be given to the volume on *Alfred the Great*, which has been so well edited, and supplied with such a worthy preface, by Mr. Bowker, the Mayor of Winchester. We have already made some extracts from the volume. On the cover is impressed a representation of King Alfred's jewel; Mr. Thornycroft's statue affords an illustration as a frontispiece; a map to show what Britain meant in the time of Alfred is inserted before

the preface, and the illustrations of the seasons are interspersed at various points in the book from the Cottonian Manuscript. Sir Walter Besant's 'Introduction' is in substance the lecture which he delivered in the Guildhall at Winchester on February 18, 1898, and which we are glad to know was published in a cheap form in the same year.¹ Sir Walter's *Story*, which also contains a photograph of Mr. Thornycroft's statue, represents a further effort on his part to make the English-speaking race understand what manner of man Alfred was, what kind of world he lived in, what he did, why we honour him, and why we should continue so to do. Mr. Frederic Harrison's essay makes rather too wide a sweep of the reign of Alfred, and suffers somewhat on this account. Perhaps 'Alfred as King'—the title of the essay—is not sufficiently definite in aim. According to the official programme of the Commemoration, a copy of which has been courteously sent to us by Mr. Bowker, and which contains an admirable account of 'Royal Winchester' from his pen, Mr. Harrison gave a similarly comprehensive title, 'King Alfred the Great,' to his lecture on the evening of the first day of the Commemoration, which seems to have closed the day 'with a satisfactory and vivid realization, and in the artistic sense, idealization' of Alfred.² His Harvard address 'On the Writings of King Alfred' is the expression of a strong desire to stir the interest of his Transatlantic audience in the Commemoration, as well as an account of the King's literary works, his lost Handbook, his Laws, and his translations from Orosius, Bede, St. Gregory, and Boethius. A deeper and more technical estimate of 'the literary achievements' of 'Alfred as a writer' is to be found in Professor Earle's contribution to the volume (p. 171) and with this should be read a learned special article on 'the poetry of King Alfred,' which appeared in the *Times* on August 20 last. The King was, we should remember, much influenced by Aldhelm's Saxon poems. Lest our enthusiasm should lead us to ascribe too large a share to Alfred in forming our mother tongue, we may do well to bear in mind that 'the modern English language is based on that of the East Midlands, and not on the literary language of Alfred's time, which was properly the dialect of Wessex.'³ It may also be convenient to add that a copy of the Lord's Prayer, as in use in the vernacular in the time of Alfred, together with two later

¹ By H. Cox, 8 Bream's Buildings, E.C.

² *Times*, September 19.

³ Boase's *Oxford*, p. 7 ('Historic Towns' Series).

copies, is printed by Mr. Churton in the appendix to his *Early English Church*.¹ Mr. Hunt gives a concise account of Alfred's translations, his method of working, and the character of his work.² The popular biographies also devote chapters to this part of the subject.³

The Bishop of Bristol's essay on 'Alfred as a Religious Man and Educationalist,' coupled with his paper in the *Guardian*, refers to an aspect of the King's life which was probably not chiefly prominent in the minds of some of those who took part in the recent Commemoration, but it is an aspect which will win the warmest admiration for Alfred from all earnest supporters of sound religious education, and the Winchester sermon of the Archbishop of Canterbury, on 1 Cor. xi. 1, reported in the *Guardian* on September 25 (p. 1289), nobly drew attention to the King's Christian example. 'Regard for religion and its chief ministers,' says Dr. Browne, was 'the settled policy of his great house.'⁴ One or two points of importance arise in this connexion. The tradition of the royal house of Wessex was undoubtedly very clearly marked in the direction of regard for the centre of Western Christendom. King Alfred was accustomed to look lovingly to Rome, whither he had been sent by his father as early as 853 or 854, and he sent gifts to Rome, especially between 883 and 890, so regularly that an omission so to do was mentioned in the Chronicle as remarkable. Dr. Browne urges that he was attracted 'to the tombs of the Apostles Peter and Paul, and not to the Pope.' That alone is rather too slender a basis for the whole of his veneration. It is to us difficult to understand why it should be thought necessary to minimize the influence of Rome on early Teutonic Christianity, or how it can be used as an argument for the Vatican theory. Rome was for the English the home of true Christianity; it was the centre of Western Christianity, the place whence the arts, ancient literature, and ancient civilization were imported into the vigorous and growing Teutonic races. England owed a great deal to Rome, and a great deal also to its distance from Rome. Another grave point

¹ London, 1840.

² *English Church*, pp. 280-1.

³ Sir W. Besant's *Story*, p. 161, on 'Alfred as Writer'; Mr. Hearnshaw's *Outlines*, p. 27, on 'the revival of learning'; Mr. Paxton Hood's *King Alfred*, p. 9, on 'King Alfred as author, and creator of English literature,' and as 'a poet and psalmist'; and compare Professor Burrows' *King Alfred the Great*, p. 18.

⁴ *Guardian*, July 3, 1901, p. 909.

in Alfred's relation to religious affairs is his way of speaking of Plegmund as 'my Archbishop,' which Dr. Browne ascribes to the 'secular Imperial influence' of Rome, and in which Professor Burrows (p. 21) seems to find a tinge of wholesome Tory Erastianism, but which we should prefer to understand in the light of Alfred's remark that a King must have his Prayer men, as well as his Army men and his Work men. The phrase was well enough when there was such a King as Alfred and such an Archbishop as Plegmund, but it is obviously open to some serious objections. Our readers are not likely now to go to Soames for their knowledge of the Anglo-Saxon Church, and therefore, before we leave the subject of the relation of Alfred to Rome, ecclesiastical or secular, we must quote Soames's amusing view of the matter:

'[Alfred] could hardly fail, through life, of associating with Rome and the papacy all that was gratifying, venerable, polished, and magnificent. A clue is thus found for understanding a weak and sinful compliance which mortifies a Protestant inquirer into the history of this admirable King. . . . Posterity is driven to qualify its veneration for his character, by admitting that he must find a place among corrupters of the national religion.'¹

So far Soames, who had delivered a course of Bampton Lectures on the doctrines of the Anglo-Saxon Church in 1830, and issued the aftermath of his materials in the form of a History, which reached a second edition in 1838. We are glad that the Catholic instincts of modern Church historians have led most of them to write in a more excellent way both of Alfred and of Rome, though Mr. Paxton Hood speaks of the 'crafty wisdom of Rome' (p. 14).

Alfred's career as a warrior is truly described as both interesting and baffling by Mr. Oman in his essay. We know enough to make the story interesting, and yet the inner motives and the details often baffle us. Hughes's *Life*, at all events, leaves nothing to be desired in the mode of telling the story of Alfred as a soldier for the general reader, and Professor Burrows (p. 6), Mr. Hearnshaw (pp. 16, 19, 30), and Sir Walter Besant (p. 79, on 'Alfred's wars') give excellent epitomes of military events. Mr. Paxton Hood boldly calls Alfred 'the father and founder of the English Navy' (p. 8), and the 'foundation' and 'development' of the navy alike find a place in the index to Mr. Bowker's volume. A phrase of Dr. Pauli's well sums up Alfred's relation both to the army

¹ *Anglo-Saxon Church*, pp. 141-2 (ed. 2).

and navy. He says that Alfred was 'the saviour of his people from total destruction' (p. 389). 'Many precious boons we owe,' in Archbishop Trench's words, to Alfred, 'but this the most precious, because it included or made possible all other—namely, that the Danish invasion was a scourge and no more, that the very life of Christian England was not crushed out by it.'¹

The King's claim to be a geographer is, of course, based in Sir Clements Markham's paper chiefly on the translation of Orosius. The remaining essays, by Sir Frederick Pollock and the Rev. W. J. Loftie, describe the part which Alfred took in making laws for his people, and in bringing them into touch with the fine arts in which his stepmother Judith had taught him to be interested. Mr. Hunt dwells upon the Christian basis of the King's code of laws, in which the Decalogue has some curious omissions.² We cannot leave Mr. Bowker's volume without paying our tribute of gratitude to him for the indefatigable industry with which he has laboured to make the Commemoration worthy of the occasion, and not least for the contribution with which he has enriched the official programme. The book was dedicated by gracious permission to Her Majesty the late Queen, who signified her approval of the proposed Commemoration. The patron of the official programme is His Majesty King Edward VII., and thus the greatest successor of Alfred and her son have both joined in the Commemoration.

One of the best of the recently issued lives of Alfred is certainly Mr. Dugald Macfadyen's *Alfred the West Saxon*.³ It is well written, reliable, and carefully composed in the light of the latest knowledge. Mr. Edward Conybeare's *Alfred in the Chronicles*⁴ is a book for the graver student as well as for the general reader. He gives a short and excellent introductory sketch of early English history down to Alfred's time, an outline of the King's reign, a rendering of Asser's Life, passages from the English Chronicle, and from the writers of a later time. Mr. W. H. Draper's *Alfred the Great*⁵ is useful not only because it gives a life of the King in outline, but because, somewhat after the manner of the Commemoration volume, it groups the multiform work of Alfred under various 'studies' or heads, such as his legislation, his anticipation of local government, and his literary labours. A special 'study' is made of the King's burial-

¹ *Lectures on Mediæval Church History*, pp. 42-3.

² See *Lingard*, ii. 418.

⁴ Elliot Stock, 1900.

³ Dent & Co., 1901.

⁵ *Ibid.*

place,¹ and some convenient bibliographical notes are included. A reader of Mr. Draper's book will find abundant reason for regarding Alfred as 'the glory of our Saxon monarchs,' and for the justification of Dr. Rees's remark that 'had he not been a King, he would have been eminently distinguished as a grammarian, a rhetorician, a philosopher, an historian, a musician, and architect.'² Among the shorter Lives is Mr. Page's *Alfred the Great*, in which the reader must remember that an unsifted Asser is a snare, though Mr. Page has written his story in a useful and readable way. A similar book, *The Story of Alfred the Great*, is the joint work of Messrs. Hawkins and Thornton Smith, and is well illustrated. Cheaper still, and ostensibly written 'for the people,' is Sir Walter Besant's *Story*, which we have mentioned above. Mr. Hearnshaw's *Outlines* is intended primarily to serve as an inexpensive guide to fuller knowledge of the life and times of Alfred. As a skeleton it will be found to be full of help, and admirably accurate. We are glad that Mr. Paxton Hood enables us to say in the Millenary year that a Life of Alfred can be bought for a penny. There is a little playing to the Protestant gallery in a passage about the Church of Rome which we regret, but for type, simplicity, and cost we have nothing but praise, and we hope that in many places it may be found possible to introduce this 'short biography' into elementary schools. Professor Burrows's lecture on *King Alfred the Great* is more suitable for adult readers, and might usefully be placed in clubs, parish rooms, and guild libraries. The Dean of Ely's sermon contains the famous passage from Freeman's introduction to the *History of the Norman Conquest*, in which Alfred is called 'a saint without superstition, a scholar without ostentation, a warrior all whose wars were fought in defence of his country, a conqueror whose laurels were never stained by cruelty, a prince never cast down by adversity, never lifted up to insolence in the hour of triumph.' And from these and other aspects of Alfred's life suitable homiletic lessons are drawn. A sermon preached by the Rev.

¹ The Rev. W. Benham, *Diocesan History of Winchester*, pp. 57-8, draws 'consolation rather than irony' from the reflection that the spot of William Rufus's resting-place is known, while that of Alfred is uncertain.

² *Cyclopædia*. Article on Alfred. Dr. Rees, we may add, quotes Sir W. Blackstone as saying that Alfred's 'mighty genius prompted him to new-model the Constitution.' And he says that the story of King Alfred and St. Cuthbert—which Freeman relates in full (*Old English History*, pp. 127-9)—was represented in a painting by Mr. West, and presented to the Stationers' Company by Alderman Boydell.

C. L. Engström before the Cordwainers' Company has been expanded and annotated into what is now practically a lecture on *The Millenary of Alfred the Great*, 'Warrior and Saint, Scholar and King.'¹ In its enlarged form the pamphlet contains a certain amount of padding, but also some useful pieces of information, such as that the official statement and appeal of the Commemoration Committee—printed at the end of Mr. Bowker's book—may be obtained gratis at the Mansion House, and that the British Museum has issued a penny paper, entitled 'Alfred the Great Millenary Exhibition, 1901.' We are informed by the authorities of the British Museum that their *Guide* is already out of print, and unlikely to be reprinted. Lord Rosebery's speech at Winchester, on September 20, was reported in the *Times* on the following day, and has since been printed in a penny eight-paged pamphlet.² We may add that Mr. F. B. Jeffery has published a 'condensed biography of England's one and only Alfred,' under the title of *A Perfect Prince*,³ and that Mr. E. L. Hill has wrought a play of three acts in blank verse called *Alfred the Great*.⁴ The extremely meagre article on Alfred in the ninth edition of the *Encyclopædia Britannica* hardly deserves to be mentioned.⁵ It is obvious from what has been said above that there is no lack of good Alfred literature to suit the taste, the scholarship, and the purse of all; and we hope that we have done more to spread the knowledge of Alfred by reviewing this literature as fully as we have done than would have been possible if we had simply added another necessarily brief biography to the existing lives. We shall simply, in the space which remains, notice the great landmarks of Alfred's life, and make some observations on a few salient points.

He was born in 849, or, as Mr. Hunt, on the authority of the preface to the so-called Winchester version of the Saxon Chronicle, would say, in 848,⁶ at Wantage, the birthplace, in 1692, of the author of 'the most argumentative and philosophical defence of Christianity ever submitted to the world,' and the scene in the last century of the labours of one of the typical parish priests of England. Mr. Hearnshaw, at the

¹ Longmans, 1901.

² Humphreys, Piccadilly.

³ Elliot Stock.

⁴ Fisher Unwin.

⁵ It consists only of 3 columns, and follows an article of 5 columns on Dean Alford. Other comparisons show that 6 columns are devoted to Pope Alexander VI., 11 columns to Alexander the Great, over 100 to Algebra, and 250 to Agriculture.

⁶ *English Church*, p. 260, note.

heading of his eighth chapter, prints the inscription of Count Gleichen's statue of Alfred which stands at Wantage:

'Alfred found learning dead, and he restored it;
Education neglected, and he revived it;
The laws powerless, and he gave them force;
The Church debased, and he raised it;
The land ravaged by a fearful enemy, from which he delivered it.'

When the child was about four years old he was taken, in 853, on the celebrated journey to Rome, and in the words of the Chronicle, 'Lord Leo (Pope Leo IV.) hallowed him and took him for his Bishopson,' so greatly to the horror of Soames! What this actually means is not determined. Mr. Hunt and Mr. Hearnshaw think that the phrase refers to confirmation, and Dean Stubbs makes no choice between baptism, confirmation, consecration, and dedication to kingship. Asser's narrative is not easily harmonized here with the Chronicle, and on the whole it seems better to understand the statement merely of a general fatherly spiritual patronage and benediction. The pretty story of Alfred winning a book from his mother Osburh, when he could read it, is mixed up with impossible dates, but connects Alfred's name with love of learning, and so fixes in the mind a true trait of his character. In 868 he married Ealhswyth, of the tribe of the Gainas. They occupied a region in Lindsey which is rich in Saxon and Danish memories, with Gainsborough for its capital, and Sidnacaester (Stow) and Tioulfingacaester (Torksey or Littleborough) a few miles away. To have provided Alfred with a bride may rank as the chief historical claim of a town which is not without some other points of interest, for it was practically the capital of Swegen, and in later times was the birthplace of a Richard who built the Angel Choir at Lincoln, of a fourteenth-century bishop of Worcester, and of Simon Patrick, Bishop of Ely. It was the scene of a skirmish in the Civil War, and is well described under the name of St. Ogg's in the *Mill on the Floss*. The devastating Danes burnt the venerable church at Stow two years later, and the building still bears the marks of the fire. With Alfred's marriage some mention must be made of that frightful and mysterious malady which tormented him from the day of his wedding to the day of his death, 'a strange disease,' says Freeman,¹ which makes all the great things that he did even more wonderful. An extract from Pauli is given by Bishop Lightfoot in his Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians,² showing, as Professor Jowett had

¹ *Old English History*, p. 116.

² p. 190.

already pointed out, that this agonizing visitation bore some distinct points of likeness to St. Paul's thorn in the flesh. The bishop says that 'the value of the illustration is diminished by the suspicion attaching to the so-called Asser,' and the professor, though he says that 'this is a remarkable parallel,' is careful to qualify his words by a quotation from Luther to the effect that St. Paul's 'was not that manner of temptation.'¹ The passage on the nature of the disease in Sir Walter Besant's *Story* (p. 78) is as good as any that we have seen, and is all the better because, as he frankly says, he has 'no theory to offer.'

It will not be necessary here to enter into the details of the struggles with the Danes. It is enough to note that the battle of Ashdown in 871 was the crisis of the first campaign; the battle of Ethandune, followed by the treaty of Wedmore in 878, of the second; and the defeat of the army under Hasting in 897 of the third. To the period of retirement at Athelney in the spring of 878 belongs the story of the cakes which, if not of prime authority, is popularly inseparable from Alfred's name. At any rate, from this retreat Alfred came forth, as Mr. Wake-man says, by a happy parallel, 'like a second David from the rocks of Engedi,' to be 'a hero and a saviour,' and 'the pattern of Christian royalty. No speck of self-seeking or of brutality mars the brightness of that sunny life.'² The closing years, about which full information is sadly wanting, were filled, it seems, with the constructive works of peace. The King sorted the old laws, rather than made new ones, but, as Green observes, 'unpretending as the work might seem, its importance was great. With it began the conception of a national law. The notion of separate systems of tribal customs for the separate peoples passed away; and the codes of Wessex, Mercia, and Kent blended in the doom book of a common England.'³ However highly we appreciate what Alfred did for learning, we no longer call him the founder of the University of Oxford. The legends about Oxford and about Alfred have been analysed so thoroughly in Mr. Parker's *Early Oxford* that the work will not need doing again. The time was, however, and that not so very long ago, when Alfred's foundation of Oxford was gravely

¹ Jowett's *St. Paul's Epistles*, i. 369.

² *History of the Church of England*, p. 59.

³ *History*, p. 93; compare Stubbs's *Constitutional History*, i. 224 (Library Edition, 1880); see also under 'Alfred' in Dr. Stubbs's index. The concluding chapter of Asser contains some important information both as to the King's judicial functions and as to his 'local courts.'

accepted as a fact, in common with other late interpolations of Asser. Mr. Hallam, in his *Middle Ages*, thought that the Alfredic foundation of Oxford University, if not maintainable as a truth, yet contained no intrinsic marks of error.¹ Mr. Churton says that one of Alfred's first labours was to restore the school at Oxford, 'which seems to have remained from Archbishop Theodore's day.'² A good many details of evidence are enumerated by Collier,³ who both says that he will not pretend to draw his own conclusion from them, and also that 'it is certain that Alfred settled a noble seat of learning at Oxford.' The crucial fact, duly recorded by Mr. Boase, is that the earliest reference to Alfred's founding the University of Oxford is in Higden's *Polychronicon*, written under Edward III.⁴ Singularly little is recorded of Alfred which lowers our admiration of his character. If we mention his impatience at Escendune when Ethelred persisted in his attention to the Mass while the heathen Danes were rapidly advancing; the fact that once he trusted, credulously, to the Danes' oath upon Christian relics; the alleged levity, haughtiness, and neglect of justice to the poor of the early years of his reign—which Freeman did not at all believe, and supposed to have originated in the mind of some biographer of Alfred's hermit cousin, St. Neot, who rebuked the king for his conduct—we have mentioned all. Happy is he against whom so little can be truly said! The minor stories and legends about Alfred—his pious division of time, his use of candles and of lanterns, and other tales—will serve a useful purpose if they engage the attention of the people first to the stories themselves, and then to the character and the great work of the man of whom they are told. Among the relics of the King which remain, the chief place in popular regard certainly belongs to the Alfred jewel. Here it is not necessary to do more than refer to Professor Earle's book, the expansion, as it seems, of an earlier lecture to which Professor Burrows alludes (p. 14). It is a relic at least of the tenth century, and Professor Earle is inclined, on linguistic and other evidence, to say of the ninth; it is a specimen of pure Anglo-Saxon workmanship, owing, something probably to Celtic sources, but not con-

¹ iii. 524.

² *Early English Church*, p. 210.

³ *Ecclesiastical History*, i. 392-7. The curious reader may turn to Soames, p. 153; Dr. Giles, p. 298; and the *British Critic*, xxiv. 139.

⁴ *Oxford*, p. 128. Compare *A History of the University of Oxford*. By the Hon. G. C. Brodrick, pp. 1-2

nected with Byzantine art. Mr. Elworthy wrote to the *Times*, on October 1, to express his satisfaction that his view of the 'jewel,' as part of the 'oestel' or pointer sent by the king with one of his presents of books, was favourably entertained by Professor Skeat and Sir John Evans at the Winchester commemoration. It was made presumably for Alfred's use, and at Alfred's orders, before he became king. It was lost by him in Athelney, found there in 1693, and afterwards deposited in the Ashmolean Museum at Oxford.

Alfred died, says the Saxon Chronicle, in 901, 'six days before the mass of All Saints.' This day cannot be October 28, as Sir Walter Besant says (p. 201). Dr. Giles reckons it to be October 26. We rather suppose that in the ecclesiastical method of counting in both the first and the last day of reckoning it was October 27. The year is a matter of dispute. Dr. Giles quotes various enumerators (p. 367), and Sir Frederick Pollock has recently said that 899 appears to be the true date.¹ Mr. Hunt says that the dates in this part of the Winchester version of the Chronicle are a year in advance, and therefore places the death in the year 900.² Sir Frederick's date is supported by Mr. Stevenson.³

Truly Alfred deserves to be praised among our 'famous men and our fathers that begat us.'⁴ The early verses of that notable chapter of the Son of Sirach are applicable to him almost without change. Alfred, as Dean Church has said,

'was the flower and type of the Wessex Kings. Sober, dauntless, resolute, patient, he met his circumstances, dark or bright, as they came, with the same steady temper, the same high public spirit. Receiving his kingdom amid calamity and disaster, overpowered and overmatched, he retired, biding his time, but not losing hope, till his opportunity came, and he was able to win and enforce a peace. By the peace of Wedmore . . . he abated though he could not entirely check the pressure of the northern rovers for nearly a hundred years, and thus gained a breathing time for the works of peace. Alfred, serious in his religion as in all he did, and in this as in other things full of sympathy with his people, applied himself to raise and improve them. He set on foot reformation in the Church. He rekindled the lost learning of Bede and Alcuin; he awakened what was equally precious—greater in this than the great Charles—the faith, the confidence of Englishmen, in the powers and worth of the English tongue. He wrote, he translated, he edited in English. He represents in the highest degree all the humanising tendencies of

¹ *Times*, August 13, 1901.

² *English Church*, p. 285.

³ *English Historical Review*, xiii. 71.

⁴ *Ecclus.* xlv. 1.

the time, the efforts to bring out what was excellent and noble in the national spirit, and to cast off what was barbarous. In this he was like Charles the Great; but in Alfred there was more soberness of aim and purity of life, with more care for justice and mercy. Alfred is the father of the English Navy; he saw, like Edgar after him, that England, to be safe, must be powerful on the sea. He was a legislator, reverencing and holding to the past, but owning the changes of the present, and not venturing too much to bind the future. . . . Alfred set the standard of an English ruler; one who thought not of himself, but of his charge and duty; who did nothing for show, and sought not his own glory, but gave himself, and his credit too when necessary, to the interest of his kingdom, and the work of his place. . . . The strong personal influence of the West Saxon Kings had much to do with uniting the English people. . . . But there was another influence continually at work. . . . The great agency of fusion and unity was the Church. . . . The Anglo-Saxon Church was pre-eminently a popular Church.¹

Certainly Oswald, Alfred, Victoria are bright names in English history, never to be forgotten (Psalm cxii. 6). But the greatest of Sovereigns pass away, like the meanest of their subjects, from their earthly realms. One King alone there is who reigns for ever, and the Church of England, through which He pours perpetual benediction upon the English people, will remain as our abiding treasure until He come.²

ART. IX.—EDUCATION IN PARLIAMENT.

1. (a) *Education Bill*, 1896. (b) *Board of Education Act*, 1899. (c) *Education Act*, 1901.
2. (a) *Orders in Council under the Board of Education Act*, 1900 and 1901. (b) *Minute of the Board of Education establishing Higher Elementary Schools*, April, 1900. (c) *Return of Statistics of certain Higher Grade Schools*, August, 1901.
3. *The Times*, September 13, 1901. Address of Sir John Gorst to the Educational Science Section of the British Association Meeting at Glasgow.

IT will, we believe, be a great misfortune to this country if the present Government does not succeed in—we will not say solving the education question—but in introducing a

¹ *Beginning of the Middle Ages*, pp. 177-8, 181-2.

² Messrs. Putnam's Sons announce a volume on *Alfred the Truth-teller*, as in preparation by Mr. F. Perry in the series of 'Heroes of the Nations.'

coherent national system. The education question cannot indeed be solved any more than any other political problem, for it has been well said: 'The educational problem is perpetual; it has not been, nor perhaps can ever be, solved. For it is the adjustment of moral and intellectual discipline to the characteristic conditions of the times, and these conditions are necessarily variable.'¹ But the time has clearly come when the chaotic and incoherent inefficiency which at present prevails should give way to an efficient and practical system.

There is certainly a need. If we look back at the experience of recent years, we believe that the failures of the country have largely been due to intellectual shortcomings. It is that which has become painfully apparent to many of us who have been quite ready, as far as possible, to avoid unnecessary criticism of the conduct of a war which circumstances have made abnormally difficult. Yet, whether in the preparation for it or in innumerable details of the operations, there has been a conspicuous absence of thought or trained intelligence. It is the great want of technical training and of mental effort which is helping to undermine our commercial supremacy. Many of us who have been following the record of our public schools with great care are becoming more and more conscious of the failure of the schools in just the one thing for which they primarily exist—mental training. Not only do they exaggerate athletics, but athletics have lost half their true value as a training since they have become so highly organised, and since the athletic masters, the professional, and the lavish supply of funds have taken away the need of thought, organization, and management on the part of the boys. And this corresponds to a very definite decay of mental culture and interest among the classes which claim to be educated. Almost every country house has a well-selected library made in the early half of the last century; how few have in any way kept it up to date! We believe that the same criticism might be directed against other departments of life, and notably, of our religious life. But our illustrations are probably sufficient.

We are of opinion that the present Government, if it braces itself for the task, is peculiarly fitted to solve it. If the country is unintellectual, our Government is singularly intellectual; probably one of the strongest bodies, from an intellectual point of view, that has ever governed a country. Both its strength and weakness proceed from this cause. It

¹ J. E. C. Weldon, *Fortnightly Review*, May 1890.

has been wisely unsentimental. But it has been cynically indifferent to conciliating sentiment. It is often strangely wanting in sympathy, and it shows the curious absence of conviction in many directions which is the result of over-intellectual subtlety. But all these qualities, if it would only attack the problem seriously, would make it singularly fitted to deal with the education question. It would have no sympathy with the professional educationist or the School Board devotee ; although, as Churchmen, we may hope for fairness from it, we need not expect and should not claim more. If it would only have the courage of its convictions, and would believe that the problem demands to be attacked seriously, it might pass a useful, even a great measure.

All these qualities are conspicuous in the Vice-President of the Committee of Council on Education. Sir John Gorst has shown his ability and, we may add, his curious detachment, at the meeting of the British Association. If on any of the great opportunities which during the last five or six years have presented themselves he could have been induced to take himself, or his audience, seriously, the education question in England would not be in the state in which it now is. The demand which education makes upon those charged in England with its public administration is perhaps excessive ; but the claims on time and thought made by a subject not only of intrinsic greatness but of supreme national importance cannot be small. One thing, however, is necessary. An Education Minister must possess a real conviction of the value of education, a conviction shown not merely on the platform but in the patient continuance of well-doing in the seat of administration. Such a test may be a severe one, but it is time that those who are responsible to Parliament for this department of State should enlist the interest of the public in the difficulties and the importance of this task : if these problems are to be solved, it can only be by the intelligent pressure of public opinion, and such opinion can best be formed by authoritative, popular, and repeated expositions of the facts of the case and the needs of the country.

But Sir John Gorst appears to bring to his present task neither personal conviction nor carefully thought-out plans. If only this last of the Vice-Presidents could for a whole Session forget himself in his work and apply his undoubted ability to the task of informing himself, Parliament, and the public of the momentous importance of establishing in England, without further delay, a right system of education

his name might yet outshine in public esteem that of any of his predecessors in office, to whom, indeed, so great an opportunity never came. We do not, however, expect so eminent a conversion, and, since the fight over next Session's Education Bill will be won or lost in the House of Commons, it is our fervent hope that the Leader of the House will take charge of the measure. In our opinion its fate depends almost entirely upon that condition being fulfilled.

The problems of education are partly legislative, partly administrative, partly more directly educational. The present phase is consciously legislative, and as such we shall here attempt to deal with it. Not that the administrative and the educational phases are in themselves less important, but because, for the moment, their consideration may be postponed. The legislative aspect of education is now before the country; the Government has undertaken to deal with it immediately: Mr. Balfour has definitely promised that an Education Bill shall have an early and honourable place next Session. It therefore behoves us to turn serious attention to the problems of the legislator and the administrator with the object, at this crisis, of helping forward the solution by all means that lie in our power. And we believe that we shall treat the religious question in the wisest way, not by isolating it, but by treating it as one part of a great national need.

It will afford slender consolation even to the most ardent supporter of the present Government, to reflect that most of the difficulties which are likely to beset the promised Education Bill will have been brought about by a timid and half-hearted policy which hardly deserves the name of policy. For a responsible Ministry to have brought in a great Bill, as was that of 1896 when first conceived, and to have allowed it to be smothered by amendments; to have brought in a partial measure like that by which the Board of Education has been established, and to have occupied two sessions passing it; to have brought in, under compulsion of the Cockerton judgment, an Education Bill of nine clauses, and to have withdrawn it in favour of a one-clause Bill, is not merely to have incurred discredit, it is to have courted disaster. To the friends of the Government such procedure has entailed a series of bitter disappointments, since it is impossible to say whether the golden opportunity for a great conciliatory measure may not already have passed beyond recall.

It may, at any rate, confidently be predicted that the autumn will witness throughout the country the excursions and alarms of threatened vested interests. Aggrieved School

Boards, supported by the National Union of Teachers, will make every effort to influence and prejudice members of Parliament against any redistribution of educational powers among existing local authorities which may be proposed. A one-sided view of the duty of the State to education will be vigorously expounded from many platforms; few voices will be heard advocating quality rather than quantity of education as essential to national welfare, while fallacy and misstatement will, as in the spring and summer, once more be strenuously advanced by those who desire the present order of things to continue. The Government will be denounced as attempting to defraud the working man's child of his chance in life, and the Church of England will be accused of having entered into an unholy alliance with the Government to hamper and possibly to overthrow School Boards. It may be said that false cries and false issues such as these do little harm except among the ignorant or prejudiced, but those on whom will fall the brunt of the conflict for the establishment of a comprehensive and equitable settlement of the Education Question cannot afford to ignore the fact that those who deliberately adopt a method of warfare by which the true issue is concealed and the interest of a part is declared superior to that of the whole, possess the stupendous advantage of solidarity and mobility. School Boards and associations of Elementary Teachers have, by constant practice, learned not only how to organize their forces, but also how to manufacture public opinion, and how to make individual members of Parliament uncomfortable. We believe that there are, as a matter of fact, no grounds at all for this feeling of discomfort, and that the number of votes which the Free Church Councils and the National Union of Teachers will change is quite infinitesimal.

It is the duty, then, of the supporters of the Government to call to mind what has already been accomplished since 1895 in the way of evolving a national system of education, and, if that record seems insufficient, to recall the unprecedented claims on public money and parliamentary time which have been made during the last two years by affairs in South Africa. It then remains to rouse themselves once more to the conflict, and to endeavour by reasonableness, by conciliation, and by harmonious co-operation to assist the Government to perform its difficult task and to redeem the honourable pledge it has given.

It may be well briefly to enumerate what legislative and administrative steps have been taken since the present Govern-

ment came into power, to indicate in what the real importance of these steps consists, and to point out the chief difficulties which seem likely to confront the promised Bill. For the present purpose of review the Report of the Secondary Education Commission of 1895 may well form our point of departure. We select this Report as containing the latest authoritative presentment of the case for legislation on secondary education, and although it has been the fate of every Royal Commission on Education not to have had its recommendations adopted *in toto* as the basis of legislation, yet the recommendations of this Commission have already been more fortunate than most other similar Commissions in this respect; and, if we are not mistaken, its influence, although it dealt only with one branch of education, has by no means yet become exhausted. But, in any case, its members deserve the grateful remembrance of the public, because they have indicated clearly what the chief defects of English organization are, and what are the various modes by which, so far as legislative and administrative actions can be made effective, these defects can best be overcome or minimized. Two points are specially urged in the weighty words of the concluding paragraphs—the urgency of the situation, and the need of a system. Neither of these points has become less important in the course of the six years which have passed since their issue. The Commission called attention to the urgency of systematic organization, not merely, they said, in the interest of the material and intellectual activity of the nation, but no less in that of its happiness and its moral strength; by ‘system’ they meant, they carefully explained, neither uniformity nor the control of a central department, but *coherence*, as an organic relation between different authorities and different kinds of schools, which would enable each to work with due regard to the work to be done by the others, and would therewith avoid waste both of effort and of money.

‘Of the loss now incurred through the want of such coherence and correlations it is impossible,’ continues the Report, ‘to speak too strongly. It is the fault on which all our witnesses and all our assistant commissioners unite in dwelling. Unfortunately, so far from tending to cure itself, it is an evil which every day strikes its roots deeper. The existing authorities and agencies, whose want of co-operation we lament, are each of them getting more accustomed to the exercise of their present powers, and less disposed to surrender them. Vested interests are being created which will stand in the way of the needed reforms. . . . Thus the difficulty of introducing the needful coherence and correlation becomes constantly greater,

and will be more serious a year or two hence than it is at this moment.' (Vol. i. pp. 326-7.)

We have already referred to the steps taken in Parliament since the accession of the present Government to power. From one aspect this seems a slender move, but it has a satisfactory side. The steps are few, but they will not have to be retraced; hesitating, but in the right direction; and what is more the result is cumulative. The substitution of a block grant for the variable grant would of itself work a silent revolution in elementary schools by evolving reasoned and appropriate courses of study instead of the present series of unrelated subjects. Add to this the recognition of higher elementary schools, also with regulated courses of study, and the new regulations for evening schools, and it is evident that the lines of organization as regards one branch of education are already planned out, and that too with due regard to the place of that branch in a national system.

Further, a new method of legislation has been discovered which will have the effect of minimizing the necessity of recourse to the cumbrous machinery of legislation. What Mr. Bryce called the new patent method of legislation has been applied to the framing of Education Bills: this method consists in presenting for Parliamentary sanction a mere outline or sketch of the scheme proposed; when this outline has been adopted the details are filled in afterwards by the department of State concerned and placed before Parliament. This method was strongly objected to by certain members in the House, as taking away effective Parliamentary control, but it appears to possess certain very considerable and compensating advantages: in the first place, some such method has become necessary owing to the skill with which opposition by amendment has been carried on. Parliamentary opposition has been thus elevated almost into a fine art; and it becomes incumbent on the Executive to devise some method for carrying on the business of the country. Secondly, the method gives an elasticity which education of all subjects needs, for if experience proves the first filling in of details to have been wrong, the office can start afresh without the inordinate delay which the need of a fresh Act of Parliament necessitates. Of the need of this elasticity the Technical Instruction Acts form a case in point. The first Act, passed in a hurry in 1889, contained a detailed definition of technical instruction, prolix, confused, and self-contradictory, which, as Lord Salisbury has recently

pointed out, was impossible of application. Fortunately a plenary power of interpretation had been given to South Kensington by the Act, and the definition was in fact ignored and never became operative. Even with that safety-valve the Act as it stood was unworkable, amending Acts in 1891 and 1892 were passed, and last session the Government boldly proposed to repeal the whole series. In the third place, the method of proceeding by Order in Council, under which each proposed Order lies for forty days on the table of both Houses, happily combines the advantages of official experience and Parliamentary sanction, the former welding details into a unity of policy, the latter accepting or rejecting the policy as a whole. Such a method effects a double saving of public time, first, when the measure is before Parliament, and again after it has become operative. It is true that the method adopted has a tendency to shift the supreme control of Parliament over details from the determination of the precise wording of a definition or a clause to points of administration which can be raised on the Estimates. In the subject under discussion this seems an indisputable advantage, and we are of opinion that experience will approve the method thus adopted.

The next step of the Government has met with almost unanimous approval. It has taken power under the Board of Education Act to consolidate into one the three central authorities which formerly divided between them the administration of English education, viz. the Charity Commission, the Science and Art Department, and the Education Department. Although the Act which authorised this needed reform was passed two years ago, the process of consolidation is by no means complete. By an Order in Council only now coming into operation (September 1901), the power of making schemes for endowed schools has been removed from the Charity Commission, which henceforth will deal with non-educational charities only, and has been entrusted to the Board of Education, the clerical staff of the Endowed Schools side of the Charity Commission being transferred to the office at South Kensington, which, under the style of the Board of Education (South Kensington), now administers all education that does not come under the Elementary Education Acts. Thus the Education Office, triple as to tradition, has become dual as to its working, and it is probable that real unification will only take place when the buildings of the new Education Office in Whitehall are completed, and when all the officials of this Department

of State are accommodated under one roof, and serve, in practice as well as in theory, one chief secretary. As yet, virtual unity of spirit, combined with actual diversity of operation, is far from attainment in the Education Office.

Meantime, the fact remains that there is general approval of the main principles and aims of the Board of Education Act, and that there is discernible everywhere, and not least in the House of Commons, the desire that in the local administration of education also there should be a consolidation of educational forces. This aspiration has crystallized into the phrase: For all branches of education—one local authority. But is this consummation desirable? Is it practicable? In view of next Session these questions are specially worthy of consideration. For the Education Bill of 1902 will contain the answer which the Government proposes.

Speaking broadly, two main courses, and only two, are open for decision. The measure might deal with Secondary Education only, or with both Secondary and Elementary.

The advantages of dealing with Secondary Education only are considerable; the approximately best local area is not difficult to fix upon; the overlapping of rating areas is thus reduced to a minimum; the religious question, at least in an aggravated form, need not arise; there would, therefore, be no need to reopen old controversies or to overturn old compromises. From the point of view of Parliamentary time such a solution might appear eminently desirable, especially as it may be truly affirmed that secondary, rather than elementary, is the branch of education which most needs improvement and systematic handling. It may, however, be objected that many of the foregoing advantages are more fictitious than real; the rating difficulty, the religious difficulty, are in solution, as it were, even in a Secondary Education Bill, and might be precipitated at any of its stages. In view of this contingency the Cabinet might reasonably conclude that the time has come for discarding half measures, and for facing these difficulties in a large and comprehensive measure, by which the Government would be content to stand or fall. We cordially hope that this course will commend itself to the Cabinet, that a comprehensive and conciliatory Bill may be introduced, that the intolerable strain under which Voluntary schools suffer may by this means be at once removed, and that the principles of a lasting settlement may be adopted.

Before discussing the difficulties which stand in the way of establishing a national system of education in England,

the sense in which the phrase is used should be indicated. It may, perhaps, be assumed that a really national system must include the nation, and not merely sections of it. It must be applicable not only to town but also to country districts; it must provide for denominational as well as undenominational education; it must assign to education a definite place, with specific powers and defined responsibilities among other Imperial and local interests. The aim of such a system would be to focus for the service of the State all the moral and intellectual resources which can be made available by training and developing the natural powers of the individuals of which the State consists.

In order to accomplish this object with any approximate degree of completeness, a methodical system of relationships must be set up between the duties and powers of the various bodies and individuals on whom depend in various degrees the carrying out of the aim proposed. Appropriate educational and financial audits must be devised and enforced, links between the various parts of the system must be established throughout, and reports and comparisons as to the working of the whole, and of its various parts must be provided for and periodically issued. In other words, if Education, in a national sense, is to become the care of the State, imperial and local funds must be made available for all its branches; the respective duties and powers of the central authority, local authorities and governing bodies must be clearly defined; proper methods of inspection must be instituted and applied, and annual reviews of the work done must be issued.

Such a task would be difficult of completion even under an autocratic government and in a new country. In England its accomplishment is rendered of tenfold difficulty by the hostility of vested interests, by false ideals of local government, even by the existence of old buildings costly to adapt and impossible to move. Any practicable constructive scheme has therefore to recognize these limitations, and be content to fit existing bodies and institutions into the new order with as little disturbance as may be. It is thus evident that all the various interests concerned must concede something of their extreme claims if a settlement is to be arrived at. But it is also probable at this stage that an Education Bill which, in order to deal justly with the many claimants for consideration, proposed a large scheme of reconstruction, would by its completeness be more likely to commend itself to public favour than a small Bill dealing

with one branch only of the matter. A good deal of the criticism on the Government side of the abortive Education Bill of the last Session was based on its slight and inadequate character. A larger measure would appeal to principles of the highest importance. If a 'large Bill' policy were adopted by the Government, the questions raised in 1902 of the relation of the State to education would be those of 1870, only set in a new and enlarged conception; and a settlement thus arrived at would affect in a greater or less degree all branches of education, not elementary schools alone. The main questions to be decided in Parliament would be whether denominational schools shall receive rate-aid, whether one local authority, or more than one, in each area shall be empowered to raise a rate for educational purposes, whether such rate shall be limited or unlimited in amount, what educational powers and duties shall accompany such rate, and in what measure and degree the provision and maintenance of the various educational institutions shall fall upon the local bodies concerned.

Difficulties such as these might well make even a strong Government pause, and only a certainty of widespread and strenuous support is likely to hold the present Government to so considerable an undertaking; for it is not alone the religious question, as it is called, which will make the Bill contentious; the rating question is almost as complicated, and any proposal to mark off the different branches of education from each other will raise many a gale of controversy. Moreover, the difficulty of coping with each of these problems is much increased by the fact that each separately divides both sides of the House. The line which divides one political party from another is not determined by views held concerning religion, or rates, or education. It is therefore strongly to be hoped that the Bill will be drafted so obviously on national lines that the broad principles which it embodies may win acceptance for the actual details it includes and implies.

The main principle of the Bill must, we conceive, be that of local option. Local authorities must be created, and must be entrusted with large educational powers, such powers being fettered only by such restrictions as Parliament shall in its wisdom think desirable. At present the restrictions placed on local authorities as to rate expenditure on elementary schools are considerable; all denominational schools are debarred from rate-aid by the Cowper-Temple clause of 1870; in secondary education, schools conducted for private profit

(however efficient they may be) are ineligible to receive grants from the County Council grant ; in technical education the rate itself is restricted to a penny in the pound. Such restrictions are opposed to the principle of local option, and ought one and all to disappear. The local authority may on one condition, even with an unlimited rate, be trusted to exercise sufficient economy. That condition is that it should not, as are the Board schools, be elected directly for educational purposes. A committee of the County Council may be trusted to realize that, however great the importance of education, the money expended on it must bear some proportion to the resources of the county, and the other very considerable demands upon the ratepayers. The danger, indeed, lies in an opposite direction ; it may be feared lest, among the many claimants on the common purse, education, especially in the higher branches, may be neglected. In our opinion this danger ought to be met by a Treasury grant proportionate, though not necessarily equal in amount, to that raised by rate by the district. This method, suggested by the provisions of the Welsh Intermediate Act (1889), under which the Treasury grant to the County Governing Body is equal to the amount raised by the county rates, has been highly successful in Wales, and if adopted in England, with such modifications as might seem necessary, would serve to bring central experience and oversight into fruitful relations with local interest and initiative.

We now turn to discuss seriatim the three difficulties spoken of—those, namely, which deal with the position of denominational schools in a national system ; the possibility of setting up a single or a paramount local education authority ; and the means by which educational requirements shall receive due attention.

It is not necessary for us to convince our own readers of the importance of the religious question. They are firmly convinced that in the interest of the State quite as much as in the interest of the Church, the preservation of religious education is of paramount importance. There is, however, one consideration which we should like to urge. If education is to be efficient and capable throughout the country, the great body of the clergy must be enlisted on its side. They have for the most part made considerable sacrifices and devoted a great amount of energy to the cause of their schools, and in many places they are the only people who have any interest in education. The farmers dislike it, the squires are half-hearted, the parents are always grumbling at

being prevented from making use of their children. The result may be seen in many of the rural School Boards, which are among the greatest blots on our educational system. We do not hesitate to say that the effectiveness of education, certainly in the rural districts, and we believe also in many town districts, will depend upon the hearty co-operation of the clergy being secured.

But if education should never be anti-clerical, there is no need, and the Church does not in the least desire, that it should be clerical. The clergy do not demand the exclusive control of the schools, nor is it in the least to their advantage that they should have it. Many of them would be glad to have some one to share the responsibility and work. What they do demand is that they should have an opportunity of giving religious instruction to their own children, and that in Church schools there should be some guarantee as to the religious fitness and moral character of the teachers. The present system, which practically excludes from the teaching of religion in Board schools the person most fitted in the case of a majority of the children to control it, is supremely foolish. But we need not dwell further on the general aspect of the question. It is not necessary to remind our readers of the value of religious education, or of the futility and unfairness of undenominationalism; nor again will the majority of those interested in religious education and Church schools doubt that something is needed. The system of Voluntary schools has become unfair. We wish we could feel that it was not so, for we regret every failure of voluntary effort, and every instance as it occurs of the increase of compulsion. But now that the burden of education has become so great, it is not fair that religious people should be doubly taxed because of their convictions, or that the wealthiest people in a parish should be able to leave all the burden of the schools on those who are less wealthy than themselves.

We have now to discuss what practical measures are possible. The Church has made an offer; and it is one which we believe to be perfectly fair and reasonable. Certain resolutions of the Salisbury Diocesan Conference were considered by the Upper House of Convocation of the Province of Canterbury, and after consideration adopted in the following form:

1. 'That a national system of elementary education, working in accordance with the resolutions following, should take the place of the present system, and should be administered by authorities representing and acting over large areas, embracing one or more administrative counties.'

2. 'That all Government grants should be paid to this authority, who shall have power to levy an educational rate over the whole area towards the maintenance of all elementary schools in that area.'

3. 'That the funds needed for capital expenditure on the school buildings belonging to any religious body, as well as for necessary extensions and structural alterations, be provided by the body to which the school belongs, but that the managers be not liable for any other expenditure.'

4. 'That power of borrowing on the security of the buildings be secured by statute.'

5. 'That all schools be financed by this authority, and that in the future certified efficient schools should receive pecuniary assistance.'

6. 'That in the management of schools belonging to religious bodies one-third of the managing committee be representatives of the educational authority of the area and of the parish, and the remaining two-thirds to be appointed as at present.'

7. 'That the appointment and dismissal of teachers be in the hands of the managers, subject to confirmation by the local authority.'

8. 'That opportunity should be given for opening new schools by means of a provision (similar to that accorded in Scotland) whereby, in considering the claims of any new school for a parliamentary grant, the Board of Education shall have regard to the religious belief of the parents of the children.'

9. 'That opportunity of denominational religious instruction should be secured by statute in all elementary schools, when desired by a reasonable number of parents, provided this can be done without expense to the managers.'

10. 'That elementary education, being a national concern, should be mainly provided for from Imperial sources.'

To these we must add the following adopted—and, we gather from the *Guardian*, unanimously—by the Joint Conference of the Convocations of Canterbury and York sitting in committee, July 1901.

1. 'That all schools be financed as far as the cost of maintenance, exclusive of repairs of the structure in Voluntary schools, is concerned, out of public funds whether Imperial or local, and that it be no condition of participation in these funds by Voluntary schools, whether any form of religious instruction be, or be not, taught in those schools.'

2. 'That the funds needed for capital expenditure on the school buildings, as well as for necessary extensions and structural alterations, be provided by the body to which the school belongs, but that the managers be not liable for any other expenditure.'

3. 'That the government of every school, and especially the appointment and dismissal of the teachers, be left in the hands of the present committee of management, with the addition of certain members appointed by, or under, rules made by the local authority,

such additional members not to exceed one-third of the whole number.'

4. 'That whenever a reasonable number of parents desire that religious instruction in accordance with their own belief should be given to their children, opportunity for such instruction should be secured to them by statute in all elementary schools, provided that this can be done without expense to the managers.'

5. That in view of the grave issues involved in the conclusions arrived at in the foregoing resolutions, a united effort be made by Churchmen to urge upon his Majesty's Government the necessity of introducing and pressing, during the coming Session, legislation on the lines therein indicated.'

Here we have a distinct offer made by the Church. Let us look at the manner in which it would work. We have in our parish a school. That school is administered by the clergymen and three or four local Church people, including the squire. We wish to make it as efficient as possible, but are continually hampered by want of funds. We receive liberal subscriptions from some of our parishioners, but one or two wealthy men refuse to take their fair share of local burdens. What is now proposed is that we should provide and keep up efficient school buildings, and that all other expenses should be borne by the local authority. In return we should be asked to have two or three members added to our managers nominated by the local authority, or perhaps elected by the ratepayers of the parish. They could not interfere with the religious teaching: they would only strengthen the hands of the managers. Moreover, if there were any considerable body of Nonconformists in the place, they would be able to provide instruction by their own minister in a class-room, while in places where there was only a Board school, the Church would be able to claim the same right for its own children. We believe (and we speak from practical experience of country parishes) that there would be nothing but gain to the Church if this proposal were accepted, and that not the least gain would be that we could feel that Nonconformist children were being treated with perfect fairness.

In a speech before the Oxford Diocesan Conference,¹ Sir William Anson put forward substantially these proposals, and he may be considered to represent a fair lay opinion,² but

¹ See the *Times* of September 26, 1901.

² We notice that the Chairman of the London School Board, in his Annual Address, claims that 'Board and voluntary schools would [as in Scotland] be treated with equal justice and impartiality.' Such a statement from such an authority ought to make it clear that the demands of the Church are both reasonable and possible.

he raised one further point which we must touch on. He would put the ultimate selection of teachers in the hands of the local authority, *i.e.* clearly the county committee. 'The managers should submit a limited number of names of teachers for selection by the local authority, while the managers should be able to require a change of teachers on the ground of incapacity to give the necessary or suitable religious instruction.' We believe that this would be a very clumsy way of appointing teachers. The managers themselves know best the local requirements of each school, and the inspector should see that the teachers are competent. But it would be absurd for a local authority administering a county area to attempt the task of making hundreds of appointments every year. What is needed and what the teachers may justly demand is that there should be an appeal to the local authority against unjust dismissal. Such an authority having financial control could easily prevent injustice.

The resolutions regarded as a whole embody a distinct and conciliatory policy. Denominational schools make a claim for maintenance on the local purse, but they are willing to accept local representation on their managing bodies, and to submit their accounts to public audit. If this offer be accepted, it cannot be doubted that the efficiency of denominational schools as a whole will largely increase, and with increase of efficiency will come increase of influence, not only to the schools but to the religious bodies to which they belong. It is a true instinct which refuses to separate the school from the Church, but the closer the partnership, the closer should be the care of the one for the welfare of the other. Too often it is forgotten that it is only the efficient school which helps and honours the denomination to which it belongs. The inefficient school, on the other hand, is a continued source of anxiety and danger in a parish.

We turn now to the educational aspect of the question, and to the difficulties which the proposed Bill will have to meet. The aim of organization, affirms the Bryce Commission, is to ensure *coherence*—in other words right relationships—between schools and educational institutions among themselves on the one hand and towards public authorities on the other. Such an orderly series of relationships simply does not exist at present: England possesses no national system of education. Existing schools and institutions in England form, not one system with co-ordinated and related parts, but several independent or parallel systems. Among

schools there is the Public School system, the Grammar School system, the Elementary School system, and besides this, there are the technical institutes and the universities.

Each member of each system is regarded as a separate and independent entity owing no duty even to the system in which it happens to be placed, still less to any member of another system, and, as owing no duty, acknowledging no outside claim. Again each system, though with varying degrees of success, endeavours, in the absence of legislative prohibition to the contrary, to provide for the whole school career of its pupils, and hence to be complete in itself. Thus the Public School system consists of the great public schools together with the private preparatory schools: these latter receive their pupils at about eight years of age, and at about fourteen pass them all on to public schools, at which they complete their school career. This Public School system of boarding schools has but a slight relation to the other public secondary schools—that is, to the smaller endowed schools (both day and boarding) and to the large town grammar schools, while its relationship to local authorities is non-existent.

In sharp contrast to this is the Elementary School system, in which the relationship of the schools to the State is of a highly organized character. Even there, however, the two branches of which this system consists have very diverse relationships to the local authority, the one being rate-founded as well as rate-aided, the other receiving no rate aid even for maintenance. As far as statute or administration is concerned, each branch of this system is complete in itself. No statutory or administrative provision exists to connect the two, or either, with any part of the other systems. It is in consequence of this lack of connexion that School Boards endeavour to prevent their pupils from passing to secondary schools, thus placing the maintenance of the School Board system above the welfare of the child.¹

Between the foregoing systems come the lesser secondary schools. These include both boarding and day schools, and form an unconnected series—not yet a system—which is badly in need of co-ordination and completion. The relationship of these schools to local authorities varies considerably, but in no case can it be called a close one, being solely dependent on the continuance of a money grant which some

¹ 'To look on Board schools as recruiting grounds for secondary schools was out of the question.' (London School Board Chairman's Annual Address, October 3, 1901.)

county authorities make. Some of these schools, as Schools of Science, receive through the same channel a Government grant under the regulations of the South Kensington Directory. The county grant is in general conditional on the Council possessing representation on the governing body, and also on the school being open to some form of county inspection. This middle section has no definite relationship to either of the other two systems, and although it is true that in town schools of this type a considerable proportion of the pupils are drawn from public elementary schools, this is a relationship which has not been provided for either by legislation or by administrative regulations, and is deliberately being weakened by the present policy of School Boards; also, not even in towns is there at present any relation whatever between the courses of study in elementary and in secondary schools in the same locality. So long as this is absent, this passage from the elementary to the secondary school is made both difficult and wasteful. In addition to these parallel groups of schools, there have now come into existence, without any assigned relationship to the foregoing, evening continuation classes, and technical institutes which provide for both day and evening students.

The want of relationship acts wastefully in several ways. It is no duty of the elementary school as at present constituted to supply the secondary schools with pupils whose ability merits an extended school course, nor of the secondary school to feed the technical institute, nor in either case to construct its curriculum, or course of study, with any specified end in view. Nor is the technical institute able to insist on a certain minimum of attainment for admission. Instead, therefore, of supplying a definite type of education, which, relatively to the schools concerned, is of an advanced character, most of these institutes throw open their doors to all comers, whether educated or not, and arrange their classes to meet the wants of the miscellaneous crowd thus collected. In consequence, elementary work that should have been done at school has to be done in class; really advanced work becomes impossible; and the outcome, as far as the nation is concerned, is an army of smatterers whose acquirements in no sense correspond either to the money and efforts expended, or to the national needs in commerce or industry, or, indeed, in any department of national life.

If, as may be assumed, the aim of setting up a national system of education be to get out of individuals and institutions the best educational work of which they are capable, it

is evident that many connexions must be established and enforced, in order that waste and undue overlapping may be minimized. It is waste of public money and effort when separate local bodies are allowed, by doing the same work, to become competitors for the same pupils: it is a waste of individual effort and intellect when pupils are retained in schools and classes in which they no longer advance. Each school and educational institution ought to have its aim well defined. Schools in the same locality ought to be linked to each other by a system of scholarships and bursaries, and pupils of ability ought to be passed onwards at specified stages to appropriate schools. The degree of success which attends this later aim is a test of the coherence which exists, and it must sadly be acknowledged, despite scholarship schemes and the attention which the Press bestows on cases of Board-school pupils who by successive scholarships have won their way to the University, there is less of this coherence to-day than existed ten years ago. Then, a steady stream of boys passed from the elementary to the secondary school; to-day, that stream has seriously lessened owing to the conflicting claims of School Board and County Councils, and it is probable that the stream will cease to flow altogether unless the whole of the educational work of a locality be undertaken by a single authority, which not finding its dignity called in question, can pay chief attention to the welfare of the children entrusted to its care.

This brings us to the consideration of educational responsibility which such an authority would have to undertake and the conditions which determine the form its work would take.

Speaking broadly, social and economic conditions tend to divide the children of the nation into two sections: those whose education ends at fourteen, and those whose education is continued in school till sixteen or nineteen, or at universities till twenty-three. Ample provision ought to be made for both these sections, the former because it contains the vast majority of children, the latter because it contains those on whom the intellectual progress of the nation and its administrative efficiency will largely depend. To the Elementary School system attaches itself the higher elementary school, and, less intimately, the evening continuation class. The Secondary School system leads to the technical institute (for which a broader base of knowledge and a longer time of preparation is necessary than for the evening continuation class), to the local college, and to the university.

Each of the types named above possesses a kind of natural area or basin of supply, and this ought to be the dominant factor in the assignment of powers to the respective local authorities. Elementary schools serve their own immediate neighbourhood; it is for this reason that the parish or union of parishes was adopted in 1870 as the School Board area, and has been continued as such ever since. Secondary schools, by train, tram, and cycle, draw from a considerably larger area. The district served by the lower continuation classes is determined by trade conditions and by the time spent in travelling; their district is larger than that of the elementary school, but less than that of the secondary school. Technical Institutes of the right kind, in order to be efficient, must possess small classes and advanced pupils. Only a very large or populous area can supply within its own boundaries an adequate number of such students.

From an educational point of view it would appear that each of the schools and institutions named above requires a different area for its proper local administration, and must therefore be assigned to local authorities administering different areas. This conclusion seems inevitable if the detailed management of individual schools which commends itself to School Boards is to continue. But this is to assume a belief in centralised administration which is by no means widespread in England. Furthermore, County Councils have adopted a method equally effective from a business point of view, and much better educationally. The bodies, owing to the multiplicity of business which comes before them, have learned the art of devolution. They devolve their work in sections to various committees, and these, in turn, devolve the details of management, including finance, upon governing bodies which, in all cases, contain representatives of the county authority. The managers appointed by Board schools are managers in name only: they have no financial power and very little responsibility beyond that of reporting to an overburdened Board. The consequence is that details come to be settled by the permanent officials, and a large degree of centralization is thus set up, and the administration of schools proceeds on uniform and mostly on rigid lines. The relation between the county education authority and the managers of schools should resemble in some degree that which exists between Parliament and the various departments of State: the broad lines of policy are fixed by the former; the latter carries these out in practice, and establishes traditional methods in dealing with questions left open to its action.

The difficulties raised by questions of area and rating powers are consequent on the foregoing considerations.

The question then arises whether it is possible for all branches of education to select one local area. The county area was not in existence in 1870; if it had been, it cannot be doubted that this area, or integral portions thereof, would have been selected in 1870 for the School Board area. If now the county area be selected, could County Councils undertake so large an extension of their present powers and, if they are able, are they willing? The latter point can only be ascertained by official inquiry; as to the former, we have already indicated an answer. By acting through governing bodies possessing defined duties and powers of managing schools, or groups of schools, it would seem quite possible for a county education committee—that is, a composite body containing both members and non-members of the County Council—to undertake the responsibility of administering elementary schools, as well as secondary schools and technical institutes; different sub-committees would undertake the various branches, and unity of administration would be secured by the committee. Such a consolidation of educational powers would ensure to the committee the services of the fittest men and women of the locality. The duties and powers of School Boards would be transferred to such a committee, but the statute might provide that, at any rate for an assigned period, the School Board might be the administrative body under the County Council. Board schools and other elementary schools would go on as before, but a series of relationships would be instituted between the various institutions, and would gradually come into operation.

The conclusions which seem to emerge out of the foregoing discussion of difficulties may now be summarized. The Government should be pressed to include elementary as well as secondary education in its measure. Voluntary schools cannot afford to leave the settlement of the religious question to the next Government, knowing by Mr. Acland's Bill of 1892 the conditions on which alone rate-aid for such schools would be granted. Local option must be accepted as the dominant principle of the promised Bill. Local education authority should be established which should be paramount over all rate-aided schools of whatever kind within its area. This authority should be a statutory committee of the County Council, and possess all the educational powers of the Council. The power of rating should be reserved to the Council. The Council should be responsible for the suffi-

ciency and efficiency of elementary education. Since such education is compulsory, no restriction of the rate for this purpose is possible; on the principle of local option no limit should be placed on the rate for secondary and technical education, especially as any limitation acts unequally over different areas. The Statutory Committee should consist as to about one-half of members of the Council, the remainder should consist of men and women specially appointed for their knowledge and experience of the various branches of education; provision should be made by statute if necessary for the delegation of powers to sub-committees, to which position such School Boards as might be retained would be relegated. The case of county boroughs would thus be fully provided for.

We feel that it would be hardly within our province to go into further detail. It is quite clear that some special provision would have to be made for London and the London School Board. The omission of this was one of the causes of the failure of the last Bill. Care, too, will be required in dealing with the larger School Boards. We certainly believe that in the schools under them more power should be given to the local managers and over-centralization thus avoided; and in whatever way they are preserved they should be definitely submitted to the county authority. The adjustment of these various details will, we believe, gradually be worked out by experience. We believe that one preliminary step is necessary, and that is, the creation of a single local authority for education, and that this authority should be a committee of the County Council. This should act by delegation, not by centralization; but possessing as it would complete financial control, as far as the rates were concerned, its ultimate authority would be paramount.

Counties, on the other hand, are far from possessing the homogeneity of county boroughs, and, in their case, a distinction should be drawn between the three areas of which the county consists, viz. non-county boroughs, urban districts and rural districts. Elementary and evening continuation schools might be placed under the control of non-county boroughs and urban districts, such areas having already developed a large sense of local responsibility; but in such case there should be reserved to the county, under conditions to be fixed by them, the power to subsidize such schools out of a county rate.

But secondary schools and technical institutes should be in the sole charge of the county, and the county should raise

an education rate over its whole area. The county, moreover, should control and maintain the whole educational provision of the rural district. Such a plan would encourage both local autonomy and county unity. The local education authorities should be expressly prohibited from managing any school or institution, except through its recognised governing body. They should be prohibited also from making it a condition of a grant to a school or institution that any particular form of religious instruction is or is not taught therein.

In conclusion, it may be hoped that the Government will thoroughly inform itself beforehand of the attitude which important local bodies are likely to take up towards any of the larger proposals of their Bill. The omission of this essential step was largely responsible for the fiasco of 1896. Also the provisions of the Bill must be such as to ensure a large measure of active public support, since the opposition is certain to be both violent and sustained. Finally, it is imperatively necessary that the Bill be in the charge of the Leader of the House, who during the past Session has shown not only an unmistakable interest in the subject, but a masterly grasp of the principles involved. It surely is a misfortune for education that at this crisis its fortunes are in the hands of two Ministers whose views of constructive statesmanship are so diametrically opposed as are those of Sir John Gorst and the Duke of Devonshire.

ART. X.—BISHOP WESTCOTT.

Lessons from Work. By BROOKE FOSS WESTCOTT, D.D., D.C.L., Bishop of Durham. (London, 1901.)
And other works.

A PERSON looking on quite from the outside would not find it easy to state the qualifications required by the Church of England in its bishops, or to account for the mode in which they are appointed. Of late years the tendency has grown to look for the rulers of the Church in the ranks of the parish clergy: but there have been times when almost any other qualification was taken into account—learning, birth, political convictions, experience in teaching boys, but not experience in dealing with the clergy or with the problems which arise in their daily parochial life. On the whole,

though the whole process has probably come into being on the basis of a strongly secular view of the Church, it has worked well. The men have risen to the work, and the result is that the line of English Bishops is adorned with the names of men who have not only served the Church well in their high office, but have brought to it powers elaborately trained in other walks of life.

On the whole, perhaps, the impartial outsider would be least likely to regard profound learning as giving any promise of vigorous and successful administrative power. For the outsider is apt, not altogether without reason, to distrust the learned. They are liable to say things of which he does not catch the meaning, to be dissatisfied with his rough generalizations, and to make criticisms which seem to him dreamy and unpractical. Moreover, he does not see what use learning will be in the work of a Bishop: he is content that anyone who likes should acquire it, but he cannot see that there will be any occasion for it in the course of a Bishop's life. The strength of the plain man's case lies, of course, in the series of so called Greek-play Bishops: men who owed their elevation to their scholarship, and never became anything else but scholars, or found it possible to turn their intellectual skill to the solution of practical problems.

The See of Durham has enjoyed, for the last twenty years, the rule of two scholars who were summoned straight from the work of the University of Cambridge to their exalted and difficult post. Both were already famous in the world of scholarship; neither had had any direct experience of parochial life. Yet both were successful as diocesans, not in spite of, but because of their learning. They brought to the work of the See powers which only the discipline of learning can produce. There have been many great administrators among our Bishops, and many men of high spiritual power, but Lightfoot and Westcott stand alone. Their learning enabled them, in their several ways, to deal comprehensively with the problems of an age of increasing specialization. Lightfoot's wide knowledge of the life of the Church in various ages enabled him to see the signs of his own day, to answer its questions, and produce the organization it required.¹ Westcott's vast and various knowledge helped him to put out in act his conviction of the unity of all in Christ, which gave him so much power with different classes.

¹ Cf. his speeches at the Lambeth Congress, 1888.

Both were signal instances of the power and value of learning when applied in the practical sphere.

That this should have been so was, perhaps, more legitimately surprising in the case of Bishop Westcott than of his younger predecessor. The line of his thought and the special character was not such as to suggest—at any rate to those who knew him through his printed works only—the promise of successful administration. The truth is, as we hope to make plain in the present article, that those who had fears of his competence for the task set before him were in error, mainly through ignorance of the man behind the books. The Bishop himself would have admitted that he had learned much from his years at Durham, but the new learning was continuous and consistent with the old.

The relevant facts of Bishop Westcott's life are soon told. He was born at Birmingham in 1825, was educated at King Edward VIth's School in that city, passed to Trinity College, Cambridge, in 1844, graduated in 1848, was elected Fellow of Trinity in 1849. He did not reside long on his Fellowship, but became an assistant master at Harrow in 1851. From 1868-1883 he was Canon of Peterborough; from 1884 till his elevation to Durham he was Canon of Westminster; and from 1870-1890 he was also Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge. These are the bare facts of the quiet career of a scholar; they form the setting of a singularly vigorous and active spiritual and intellectual life. It is always difficult with Bishop Westcott to get to the beginning of things: his mind seems to have suffered curiously little change in its main positions. Probably the strongest influence of all upon him was that of Prince Lee, the Head Master of the School at Birmingham. In his speech at Birmingham in 1896 the Bishop described his old head-master's teaching, emphasizing the vivid way in which ancient history was made to live again, the 'eloquent discourses on problems of life and thought suggested by some favourite passage of Butler's *Analogy*, the depths which he opened to us in the unfathomable fulness of Apostolic words.¹

When the Bishop spoke thus he was past the age of seventy, and had spent many years in incessant intellectual labour: it is conceivable, therefore, that he may have reviewed his school-life through the experience of a lifetime, and that his memories may have been coloured by it. The vivid realiza-

¹ *Christian Aspects of Life*, p. 186.

tion of ancient history, a profound interest in the great problems of life and thought, a sense of the unfathomable fulness of Apostolic words, have been throughout the most marked features of his own mental character, and one cannot but feel that Lee's teaching must have fallen on singularly receptive soil. But even if we allow something to the idealizing power of memory, it remains that we have here a glimpse of a very great teacher, a man who strove to raise his boys to his own level, and did not try to dwarf himself to theirs; who trusted to their possessing glimmerings, at least, of interest in life and thought, and some extra-athletic sympathies.

The result was that when Westcott went to Cambridge he had a real sense of the purpose for which he had come; he had visions and ideals, an object towards which he could work.¹ He was, doubtless, exceptionally gifted, and it may be that he was serious beyond the usual level of his years. But it is difficult to avoid contrasting this history of him with the effects of some modern types of educational product. There are very few, comparatively speaking, one is inclined to say, who come to the University with any particular object in view. They are sent there; most people go when they leave school; but they do not know 'what they are going to be,' and will leave that question to be settled till they have got their degree. Lee had his failures, no doubt; there must have been many who could never have responded to his teaching. But it is easy to see how much Westcott owed to a man who invited him to a share in his own lofty interests, with what pinched and starved resources he would have passed to Cambridge if the chief representative of learning within his horizon had aped the opinions of the least intelligent of his companions.

From the first there could have been no doubt as to the general line of Westcott's future life. His high academic distinctions made it obvious that he should succeed to a Fellowship at his College, and follow the course to which that is an opening. It is on record that Bishop Lightfoot, when he, a few years later, was elected Fellow of Trinity, was attracted by the Greek classics, and projected an edition of Æschylus. We are not aware that Westcott had any hesitation as to the line of study he was to pursue, though the *Essays on Virgil, Æschylus, and Euripides in Religious Thought in the West* show with what care and insight he

¹ *Lessons from Work*, p. 299.

had read the classics. From the first he devoted his powers to those branches of learning which lie round Theology.

It was a time when recruits were sadly needed for this work. The negative theology of the Tübingen school was making its way in England, and Dr. Pusey, who had foreseen its progress and felt the danger of it, was under the cloud which Newman's secession had brought over all who thought with him, nor had he the type of mind which was needed for the contest. It was a time when to have wavered and deliberated might have meant loss of the opportunity. And Westcott does not seem ever to have wavered. Firm in his conviction that the highest truth he knew in religion would only become more vividly certain the more carefully its connexion with historical and critical evidence was investigated, he started with his friends on the series of books to which all Christians owe so much. There are few more remarkable documents than the letters (published in the *Life and Letters of Dr. F. J. A. Hort*) interchanged between the three friends when they are projecting their *Commentary on the New Testament*. There is no idea of constructing an apology for the faith, but it is clear that Hort was somewhat nervous at first—anxious to have it clearly in black and white that the investigation to be begun was quite free, and that no consequences were to be expected except those which arose from the facts discovered. And Westcott eagerly accepts this condition: if he differs from Hort, it is only in being rather more sanguine as to the result.¹ Of the three, Westcott achieved far the most of the original plan. Lightfoot published his editions of four Epistles of St. Paul, and then turned to what he calls 'repairing a breach not indeed in the House of the Lord itself, but in the immediately outlying buildings.'² Hort's contribution never extended beyond the Fragment on S. Peter published after his death. In Westcott's case the original purpose branched out into three different series of works. In the first place, we have the works on the *Origin of the Gospels* and *History of the New Testament Canon*. The former of these rose out of a prize essay with which the author won the Norrisian prize in 1851; the other is an historical work stating the evidence for the authenticity of the various books of the New Testament. The theory presented in the *Introduction to the Study of the Gospels* as to their origin is certainly not the one most in vogue now. The notion of an oral basis underlying the various presentations

¹ *Life and Letters of Dr. F. J. A. Hort*, vol. i. pp. 417 foll.

² Pref. to Edition of *Ignatius*, p. xii, ed. i.

in the three Synoptic Gospels has given way to that of one or two earlier documents upon which our present Gospels rest. It may be doubted whether either theory is adequate to solve a problem of such unparalleled complexity; indeed, whether either is more than a formula attempting to co-ordinate the facts. The oral traditions have to take on something of the fixity of written documents in order to account for the agreements in the Gospels; and, again, their differences imply a freedom of modification from various sources on the part of the editors, which comes to look like oral tradition. But whatever be the value of the theory put forward, there is no question that the facts collected in the book are presented with the author's characteristic accuracy and exhaustiveness. The work on the *Canon* dealt less with theory and was more exclusively occupied in the collection of references: hence its value is less affected by the passage of time. The author was familiar with all that had been written on the subject at the time when he wrote, and had searched diligently and scientifically through the early writers of the Church for indications of the use of the various books. This part of his work is not likely to be superseded. New evidence will come in, and this may alter the significance of parts of the old; but the book stands so far as it goes. The first edition was published in 1855, and was followed by several others; but, though some notice was taken of the strictures of the anonymous author of *Supernatural Religion*, the author did not pursue the subject into all its ramifications. It remains a text-book of first-rate value: it does not come into comparison with works like Zahn's *History* or Harnack's *Chronologie*.

A second line of study, apart from the work of the Commentaries, was that upon the text of the New Testament, pursued in conjunction with Dr. Hort. The two friends found themselves impeded in their progress by the inferiority of the text of the New Testament as it appeared in the current editions; and so they determined to construct a manual text, based upon the free investigation of MS. authority only, for their own use primarily, but with some hope that it might prove to be of some use also to others. The task was a more extensive one than they anticipated, and the text did not see the light till 1881, when it appeared with an accompanying volume containing Dr. Hort's famous Introduction. In the meantime, earlier drafts of it had been placed by the two scholars in the hands of the Revisers, and as a result the Revised Version bears indelible marks of their

textual theory: some will regret that these marks are not more numerous. The text resulted from the independent labours of the two scholars. Westcott was at Harrow in the earlier years of the work, then at Peterborough or Cambridge; and Hort was mainly at his parish of St. Ippolyt's. Their discussions were carried on by correspondence, which, we believe, still exists. It is greatly to be hoped that some of the letters may see the light; it could not fail to be both interesting and instructive to note the process by which two such men reached agreement, or agreed to differ. The appearance of the text caused great discussion, as well it might, for the changes of it from the traditional text are numerous and, in many cases, startling. But, of all charges that could be brought against it, the most curiously irrelevant was that of Dean Burgon, who stigmatized it as the result of imagination. It was based upon the most exact statement of the facts accessible at the time; and the theoretical element in the construction and defence of it was the simplest application of common sense to the classification or interpretation of varieties of reading. The real objection to it was a deeper one than this: that the authors would not allow that the prevalence of a particular type of text from the fourth century onwards gave it any exceptional claim to authority, while Dean Burgon regarded this traditional text as inspired. Over such a difference as this there is no bridge. Recent investigations are said to have modified the situation in regard to the textual theory. New facts have come to light which will involve a different judgment upon some points, especially in connexion with the Western text. But the principles upon which the authors based their text are not imperilled by such discoveries. Any change that is made will be an advance from their position, not a going back to older theories. They did not claim to have discovered all the facts in existence; but they claimed to have dealt fairly and scientifically with those at their command, and this claim has been generally granted them by scholars.

So we come at last to the Commentaries which were originally assigned to Westcott, when the three friends made their scheme of work. These were the works of St. John—exclusive of the Apocalypse—and the Epistle to the Hebrews. It is needless to say that this task was approached in the light of the other studies of which we have spoken. All that falls under the head of 'Introduction' was carefully and completely set forth. Where critical questions arise, as they do notably in the case of St. John's Gospel, the arguments on

are not independent in the bridge; Their which, we some of be both y which r. The well it text are charges relevant result of ment of element t appli-pretation deeper hat the century, while . Over vestiga-d to the ich will ially in es upon by such advance They stence; ily with enerally

opposite sides are candidly and clearly given. But in a very characteristic way. The Bishop presents us with a finished result, and does not always let us follow him through the process of establishing it. Thus we do not find at the beginning of his Commentaries any elaborate account of the views of various critics such as is common in German editions. The slight or extensive distinctions between writers on one side or another—which seem to have so great a charm for German commentators—are of no interest, apparently, to Westcott. If here and there among all the crowd of writers one has produced some original contribution of importance, that is discussed; and so the reader learns incidentally that Dr. Westcott is familiar with the whole ground. But he has clearly digested the whole controversy before he begins to write, and has reduced it to manageable form. Such a method has its dangers, no doubt; and there is certainly room for the more cumbrous plan. But one cannot help the feeling that the mere question of the authorship of a book is, after all, a comparatively simple one, and that a limited number of considerations is really relevant. Schemes of composite authorship, which are the source of so much of the variety of theory among critics, are often only half-way houses between the direct Yes or No, and have little probability in their favour.

When we pass from the Introduction to the Exegesis we find characteristics which have been the subject of much criticism. Dr. Westcott inherited from Lee a profound belief in the value of exact verbal criticism. The following passage from a speech already quoted¹ might have been used of the Bishop himself:

‘Mr. Lee had an intense belief in the exact force of language. A word, as he regarded it, had its own peculiar history and delivered its own precise message. A structural form conveyed for him a definite idea. In translating we were bound to see that every syllable gave its testimony.’

h were s made John—ebrews. in the All that ily and as they ents on

This principle was the one which ruled the Bishop's interpretation of Holy Scripture. He did not make the mistake of supposing that there was no difference between Classical and Hellenistic Greek: but he maintained that each had its own exactness; that in neither were words or tenses used indiscriminately; and that there was no excuse for neglecting any minute detail that could possibly be induced to yield a

¹ *Christian Aspects of Life*, p. 191.

meaning.¹ Nor was he perturbed if it were argued that the author could not have had in mind all that his interpreter extracted from his words.

'Some, perhaps, will think that in the interpretation of the text undue stress is laid upon details of expression; that it is unreasonable to insist upon points of order, upon variations of tenses and words, upon subtleties of composition, upon indications of meaning conveyed by minute variations of language in a book written for popular use in a dialect largely affected by foreign elements. The work of forty years has brought to me the surest conviction that such criticism is wholly at fault. Every day's study of the Apostolic writings confirms me in the belief that we do not commonly attend with sufficient care to their exact meaning. The Greek of the New Testament is not, indeed, the Greek of the classical writers, but it is not less precise or less powerful. I should not, of course, maintain that the fulness of meaning which can be recognised in the phrases of a book like the Epistle to the Hebrews was consciously apprehended by the author, though he seems to have used the resources of literary art with more distinct design than any other of the Apostles; but clearness of spiritual vision brings with it a corresponding precision and force of expression through which the patient interpreter can attain little by little to that which the prophet saw. No one would limit the teaching of a poet's words to that which was definitely present to his mind. Still less can we suppose that he who is inspired to give a message of God to all ages sees himself the completeness of the truth which all life serves to illuminate.'²

In these words, in the Preface to the last of his great Commentaries—the book which completed the programme of 1853—the Bishop states his creed as a scholar. It is easier to smile at it than to criticise it seriously. After all, a man writing in his own language uses unerringly and by the instinct of the language certain forms. The tongue is familiar to him, and he talks or writes readily without conscious deliberation. But an interpreter in another tongue must laboriously reconstruct all that was instinctive and habitual in the writer; he will find out the precise use of words and the value of tenses, not by practice in speech like the writer, but by collection of instances and induction—laboriously. His comments will look laboured and pedantic when compared with the free movement of the text, but from the mere psychological point of view they may be

¹ The present writer well remembers the Bishop's horror on discovering in a book much belauded of reviewers—Blass's *New Testament Greek*—the statement that St. Luke used a particular tense because he liked rolling, loud-sounding words.

² *Ep. to the Hebrews*, Pref. p. vi.

necessary, much more if the subject of the book lies in the spiritual world, where much that the spiritual eye discerns escapes from the trammels of words. If these things are true it is not pedantry to deal minutely with the words ; it is just the scientific plan of using for each subject the proper method.

There is, therefore, very little difficulty in understanding the method and the result of Dr. Westcott's exegesis. His notes are very brief ; in very rare cases are they complicated by the discussion of rival views ; and there is a considerable certainty about them when once the principle on which they are made is conceded. Those who do not accept the premiss will be inclined to reject its application ; but there is no doubt about the method employed. It is when we go further, and ask what type of theological teaching did the Bishop draw from his study of Holy Scripture, that some difficulty begins ; for we have, at this point, to consider the charge of obscurity frequently alleged against the Bishop's thought in his lifetime, and recently reiterated in two articles contributed by Dr. Sanday to the *Pilot* (September 7 and 14, 1901).

What was the Bishop's theology, and what was his philosophy ? To answer these questions, even approximately, it will be necessary to recall, as far as we are able, the conditions of his education and development. It would seem probable, though we have only inferential reasons for saying so, that the Bishop was brought up in Evangelical circles ; he must have started upon his theological development with Evangelical ideas. By these are commonly meant a very firm sense of the individual's right of access to God, and a strong conviction of the necessity of conversion and of the Atonement of Christ. In many Evangelicals these ideas are developed in direct opposition to others. The right of individual access is held to dispense with the necessity of an organized body—a visible Church ; the attainment of conversion seems to exhaust the demands of God upon the Christian soul ; the Death of Christ upon the Cross is dwelt upon to the exclusion of the wider aspects of the Incarnation. There were various reasons why this limited Evangelicalism could not retain his allegiance. As a boy, so he has told us, his attention was drawn to the corporate aspect of human life by the speeches of the Chartist leaders ; and he seems to have learnt very early the emptiness of the individual apart from the society. Nor could so accurate a student of Scripture fail to notice that, while the limited Evangelical view of

things derived great support from certain isolated texts, the whole drift of the New Testament rests all man's hopes on the Twofold Nature of Christ, so that it is on His being really both God and man that the efficacy of His sacrificial acts depends.

These two doctrines—the Incarnation of the Son of God and the existence and necessity of a visible Church—were prominently defended by the Tractarians. But Dr. Westcott could never have been a Tractarian. He was an independent scholar, not a follower of a Movement; and, with all their learning, there was a sad deficiency in critical power among the Tractarian leaders. Moreover, Newman and those of his way of thinking were trained in speculative thought rather than in scholarship, and it would seem that this way of attaining results was viewed at Cambridge with profound distrust. The letters preserved in Dr. Hort's Life seem to show a sympathy with the school of Stanley and Jowett; but again there was not to be found among these scholarship of the Cambridge type, and such thinkers sat far too loosely to fundamental dogmas to approve themselves to men like Westcott and his friends.

There is thus no intelligible party designation that can be affixed to the Bishop. He was neither High, nor Low, nor Broad; but he worked out for himself a theology of his own, based upon exact and scientific exegesis. And, therefore, people who read his works are apt to be puzzled. They find premisses asserted from which they are accustomed to draw certain conclusions, but they do not find the conclusions. Instead of that, they are shut off from the conclusions they would like to draw by some note on the exact meaning of a word, or a tense, or a phrase. And then they do not quite know where they are.¹

Something of the same sort may be said of Dr. Westcott's philosophy. He had been inspired, as we have seen, by Prince Lee with an interest in the problems of life and thought, but it seems very doubtful whether he had received any special training in philosophy. At Cambridge he attained high distinction in mathematics, and must necessarily have studied Plato. But the technical language of philosophy is largely absent from his works. That comprehensive view of things which is called the philosophical view seems to have been reached by him as the result of

¹ Cf., as an illustration of this, the Bishop's treatment of St. John vi. in relation to the Eucharist; and his notes on the Intercession of our Lord in the *Ep. to the Hebrews*.

ref
th
ha
bu
rea
alw
pro
me
wid
wh
dis
min
not
not
phe
of t
phe
Her
rela
non
sch
diffe
exp
for
him
—an
mys
wha
they
I
Dr.
The
natio
with
more
sin:
char
world
most
ciliat
gulf
spirit
life, I

reflection upon his own wide range of learning, and not by the study of the works of philosophers. He never, indeed, had any special training in philosophy, technically so called, but shortly after he took his degree he spent a long vacation in reading the works of the great Positivist writer Comte, and always looked back to that as an epoch in his intellectual progress. It would account for the absence of anything like metaphysical or technical philosophic expressions, and for the wide and manifold grasp of human nature and the created world which form one of the bases of his religious thought. His discussion of the nature and limits of law in regard to miracles¹ sounds like Kant; but the Bishop was assuredly not a Kantian. 'A law of nature,' he tells us, 'can mean nothing else than the law of the human apprehension of phenomena. We are forced to regard things under conditions of time and space and the like, and the consequence is that phenomena are grouped together according to certain rules.'² Here one might have looked for some explanation of the relation of phenomena to the reality underlying them; but none is offered. In philosophical matters, as in matters of scholarship, the Bishop is primarily an observer. He notes differences in the nature of the facts which make up our experience; he shows that different methods are necessary for the approach to various forms of truth; but we get from him no scholastic scheme of things—articulate and complete—and scarcely any technical language. For he is more of a mystic than a philosopher; he sees principles, and reports what he sees. Though he speaks of them in abstract terms, they are always present to his mind in the concrete.

It is now time to approach the two questions: What was Dr. Westcott's Theology, and what was his Philosophy? The key to both is to be found in the doctrine of the Incarnation. To the Bishop's mind—and in this respect he thought with the greatest of the Greek Fathers—the Incarnation was more than an expedient devised to meet the difficulty caused by sin: it was part of the order of Divine Providence, its special character only being affected by the presence of sin in the world. Hence it was an event of which the significance was most profound and far-reaching. It was essentially a reconciliation of opposites. Before it there was an unbridged gulf between the finite and the infinite. Man, the finite spirit, limited by the flesh and the conditions of his earthly life, longed for but could not reach to God. Through the

¹ *Gospel of Resurrection*, ch. i.
VOL. LIII.—NO. CV.

² P. 25.

Incarnation—that is, by the entry of the Divine upon the conditions of humanity—this longing was satisfied; through Christ the fundamental religious impulse of man was fulfilled. Christ revealed the Father. He gave strength and directness and assurance to the weak, vague, and indecisive aspirations of man: the best of men among the heathen had thought of one God; the belief in one God was the basal dogma of Judaism. Christ, without disturbing the monotheism, revealed the Father and promised the Spirit. He spoke in human language, and lived a human life, and therefore His message was intelligible. And this message must have come in any case: it was part of man's true heritage; *vita hominis visio Dei*.

Thus the Bishop approached the Incarnation, if we may so say, from the cosmic side. He thought of the Word of God become—not made—flesh: of the Image of the invisible God in Whom all things had their system revealed in the world of experience. And this affected all his inferences from the Incarnation as a principle of thought. His natural form of expression for those in whom the purpose of Christ's coming was fulfilled was not 'the saved,' but those 'who abide in Christ,' who are 'in Christ.' With his strong sense that the Incarnation affected all nature and had a meaning for nature in all its stages, he held strongly to a belief in the value and dignity of all the lower forms of life, and the symbolic significance of all true art; and had only horror of great artistic power—such as that of Aristophanes—that was not actuated by moral purpose.¹ So, again, the thought of Christ as the typical Man—the Son of Man—led on to his Socialism. This was not an accident of political opinion, but a real outcome of his religious point of view: his strong conviction of the unity of all men in Christ made him long for some practical exposition of the idea.

Those who think most of the Incarnation from the cosmic side have a certain temptation before them in regard to evil. They are predisposed—like the great Alexandrines—to minimize it, to treat it as an element in an imperfect state of things which would work itself out almost by the inherent necessity of God's ordering of the world. So also the accompaniments of evil—death, pain, and the like—tend to receive somewhat imperfect appreciation. It may, perhaps, be maintained that on these points the Bishop was not wholly con-

¹ 'I dare not read Aristophanes,' he said; 'he terrifies me. Such power and such recklessness!'

sistent. He maintained the reality of evil,¹ but with his wonderfully ethereal and heavenward view of life he had a peculiar confidence in regard to it. Sin was not to him the blazing offence that it seems in the eyes of some; he marvelled at it, and trusted that wider knowledge and deeper insight would clear away it and the temptation to it. In the same way, though he spoke freely and believed devoutly in the efficacy of the Death of Christ, yet the Cross always appeared to him as a Victory. He could not endure representations of the Crucifixion which in any way laid emphasis on the physical side of the death, and his main ground for praising Francia's representation of the dead Christ was that 'the Body is not dead.'²

All these lines of thought are obscure in themselves, or, at least, are very difficult and not very common. And they did not gain in clearness from the Bishop's method of exposition. In the sermons and other works which were not directly exegetical he expounded his philosophy and his theology. And he did so in a peculiar way. He produced no connected or reasoned scheme in either region; but he put forward thoughts and, as it were, meditated aloud upon them, never repeating himself or putting a difficult idea in more shapes than one, but presenting his thought in a variety of aspects and leaving the reader or hearer to connect them into a whole. No doubt this made a serious demand upon persons who had the knowledge to understand and appreciate the principles of his thought, and still more upon those who had not such knowledge. But we do not think he was naturally obscure or a confused thinker, as Dr. Sanday rather seems to imply;³ though it is certain that he had a great horror of definiteness where definiteness meant loss of variety and fullness of thought, and he was fond of repeating the utterance of the painter Haydon, 'There are no outlines in Nature.'⁴

We have left ourselves but little room to speak of Dr. Westcott's work as Bishop of Durham, although his eleven years as ruler of that great See were perhaps the most splendid in his whole life. He came to a Diocese that was already fully and firmly organised, and thus the problems which confronted him were very different from those which Dr. Lightfoot had to meet. And it is well that the two great Bishops came to Durham in this order. For Bishop

¹ *Gospel of Resurrection*, p. 23 sqq.

² *Lessons from Work*, p. 448.

³ *Pilot*, September 14, 1901.

⁴ *Christian Aspects of Life*, p. 193.

Westcott's interests and habits of mind did not lead him in the direction of organization; his disposition was to leave men very largely to themselves, and he was tempted to ignore the facts, often the undesirable and regrettable facts, of actual life. It cost him, for instance, some trouble to realize that the legal boundaries of parishes in large towns were treated by the inhabitants as entirely conventional, and that few recognized the claim of their parish or district church as binding. But he had many gifts that enabled him to win his way to the hearts of the people and the clergy. He had an extraordinarily wide and unprejudiced interest in the pursuits and thoughts of men. He was prepared to listen to what people said and to consider schemes they had in view, not as matters of curious pathological interest, but with real sympathy and openness of mind. He might not be persuaded, but no one could doubt his readiness to listen and to understand. So in his successful work with the coal-strike in 1892, it was not his Socialistic sympathies which won his victory, but it was the fact that he had made a real effort to know the causes of the quarrel, as well as the fact that he could put before the combatants a lofty ideal of conduct. Either of these alone might have failed.

And he had the gift of inspiring and winning the confidence of his clergy. There has rarely been in any Diocese such an enthusiasm for Mission-work as in Durham during his Episcopate. And in times when most Bishops were agitated by ritual problems his Diocese has remained at peace. This was not because the people or clergy are all of one colour in Durham, but because they trusted and revered their Bishop. Of course he had vast learning. The boldest reader of the correspondence columns of Church newspapers would not venture to stand up against him on points of scholarship or even of ritual history. But it was not only learning that gave him his power. It was because everyone knew that he was not the Bishop of any party but recognized his relations to all parties in the Church. We have already said that he was probably inclined by education to the Evangelical point of view, but High Churchmen worked gladly with him, because they knew that he gave them credit for what they did in the light of their own convictions, and was scrupulously fair in all his interpretations of law.

Much of all this came naturally to him because he was learned, because he had, for years, been accustomed to weigh accurately problems requiring research, and wisdom, and freedom from prejudice. And more still depended upon that

wi
sa
se
lar
of
las
las
lea
be
the
on
ing
the
of

OF
Fra
reg
rem
Lar
reli
dur
earl
the
Fra
exp

Ma
read
and
the
be,
be g
to d
kind
imp
and
task
addr
diffi
your
of su

which people gradually came to know of him, his simple and saintly life, his ready sympathy, his unmistakable pleasure in seeing and trying to help those who came to him at Auckland. But of this it is not the place to speak. Left the last of the four great companions, there has gone with him the last, or almost the last, example of the best learning of the last century, and it seems sometimes as if the union of great learning with the vocation to the priesthood had ceased to be a natural product of the Universities of which the Bishop thought so highly. But if it is hard to see who will carry on his peculiar work it would be unfaithfulness to his teaching to dream that it will not be carried on. The last words the present writer heard from him were these—'I am full of hope.'

SHORT NOTICES.

Magic and Religion. By ANDREW LANG. (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1901.)

OF this work about half is a criticism of the theory which Mr. Frazer has put out in the second edition of the *Golden Bough* with regard to the origin of the belief in the Divinity of Christ. The remainder is largely devoted to strengthening and confirming Mr. Lang's own theory 'that perhaps the earliest traceable form of religion was relatively high, and that it was inevitably lowered in tone during the process of social evolution.' Mr. Lang's theory of the earliest form of religion is again incompatible with Mr. Frazer's theory of the origin of religion generally, and especially with Mr. Frazer's view that man had recourse to religion because by experience he found magic to be a failure.

From the nature of the book, as thus described, it follows that *Magic and Religion* makes a somewhat severe demand upon the reader's attention. In the *Golden Bough* resemblances, comparisons, and analogies are continually being brought forward which delight the reader because they introduce order into what otherwise would be, and indeed previously was, a mere chaos. Many of us would be glad to rest when order has thus been introduced, and be satisfied to dwell upon the simple propositions to which the progress of mankind can thus be reduced. It is not a grateful task, though it is imperative, to examine those propositions, to test the comparisons, and to ask whether order has really been restored. But that is the task to which Mr. Lang has felt himself called, and to which he has addressed himself. The first difficulty of all criticism is the difficulty of making sure that you are doing justice to the object of your criticism; and Mr. Lang is constantly aware that in a subject of such vast complexity he may not have seen or seized Mr. Frazer's

real meaning, when he has exposed the want of logic or of evidence in the chain of reasoning which he happens to be examining. To many readers it will appear manifest that the defective chain really is of Mr. Frazer's forging; and to all it will be obvious that Mr. Lang has not spared labour in endeavouring to ascertain the real meaning of Mr. Frazer's arguments. If Mr. Lang has a distaste for what he thinks he can show to be not true, he has also shirked no trouble in the attempt to get at the truth.

The earlier chapters, forming about one quarter of the book, are devoted to the task of showing that magic has not yet been proved to be prior to religion. In North America, in Greenland and in Australia, Mr. Lang calls attention to the high gods which we find among low races and among the very peoples who, on the theory that magic preceded religion, ought still to be in, or scarcely above, the stage of magic. These high gods have been dealt with in two different ways. Mr. E. B. Tylor has always recognized that they are there, and of late years has explained their presence by the theory that they have been borrowed from Europeans. Mr. Frazer simply does not mention them; and his failure to do so is the more remarkable because his acquaintance with the literature of the subject is undoubtedly great, and he quotes freely and trustingly from the writings of Mr. Hewitt, whose evidence on the point is direct and whose testimony stands high. On the whole Mr. Frazer seems to have exposed himself to Mr. Lang's criticism that 'it is only by omitting mention of the evidence for what nobody else can deny to be religion, that he can secure his theory.' Mr. Tylor's theory, on the other hand, that these supreme gods have been borrowed from Europeans, is a more workmanlike proceeding, and requires a detailed consideration of each case of alleged borrowing. Such details would here detain us too long, and we can only say that after examination of the details we are inclined to hold to the opinion which Mr. Tylor once expressed (in 1871): 'this view [that the doctrine of the Great Spirit was borrowed] will not bear examination . . . it can hardly be judged that a divine being, whose characteristics are so unlike what European intercourse would have suggested, and who is heard of by such early explorers among such distant tribes, could be a deity of foreign origin.'

As, however, Mr. Frazer does not discuss the evidence for the early belief of low races in high gods, we must assume that in his opinion it may be safely neglected, however serious the neglect may seem to other students. Neglecting it, then, Mr. Frazer is in a position to lay down his theory of the evolution of religion, in which he distinguishes three stages: (1) there is belief in magic (though not in any form of religion), and some magicians have powers so great that if the notion of gods had existed at the time they might have been called by their contemporaries man-gods; next we find that man has somehow become possessed of the idea of gods, and that these gods either (2) sojourn in the human bodies of god-men or (3) are quite independent of human tabernacles. But in any case, in Mr. Frazer's words, 'lacking the idea of eternal duration,

primitive man naturally supposes the gods to be mortal like himself.' On this Mr. Lang's first comment is that early men consider themselves to be essentially immortal and invent all sorts of myths to explain the occurrence of death as an accident, error, or infraction of a divine command. Next, according to Mr. Frazer's theory, 'primitive' man had no gods at all. Thirdly, as a matter of fact, the few instances of the graves and deaths of gods which Mr. Frazer cites cannot possibly serve to prove that the Greeks, the Egyptians, or the Babylonians believed their gods to be mortal. On the contrary, as Mr. Lang says, among all peoples 'the gods keep on being immortal.' Mr. Frazer's 'instances of beliefs that the high gods are dead notoriously contradict the prevalent belief that they are deathless. And the prevalent belief regulates religion.'

But whether the gods are or are not believed to be deathless, they are, in the second of the three stages of religion mentioned above, supposed to reside in the bodies of mortal men; and Mr. Frazer conjectures that their worshippers, having got them, are afraid of losing them. If the human body in which the god resides were to die unexpectedly, then the god would escape from the body, and would thus evade the control which his worshippers exercise over him. Therefore, according to Mr. Frazer's conjecture, the greatest care is exercised to prevent this contingency: another human frame, more youthful and less liable to collapse, is provided; and the old, or relatively old, human body is killed, and the god, in some mysterious and unexplained way, is transferred into the more youthful body. That is the conjecture; and the question is whether there are any facts to support it. Mr. Frazer produces some fourteen instances in confirmation of his conjecture. But the result of Mr. Lang's examination of these instances is to show that they do not confirm or in any way support the conjecture. 'So recalcitrant is the evidence, that of all Mr. Frazer's kings who are here said to be gods, or to incarnate gods, not one is here said to be put to death by his worshippers. And of all his kings who are here said to be put to death, not one is here said to incarnate a god.' The importance of this for the Christian religion is that, according to Mr. Frazer, the supposed Divinity of Christ found ready acceptance 'wherever men had heard the old, old story of the dying and risen god.' The unfortunate thing for this theory of Mr. Frazer's is that the fourteen instances adduced by Mr. Frazer to show that a god is supposed to be transferred from one dying human body to another more healthy body 'do not contain one example of a "dying and rising god" stated to be represented by a living man who is therefore killed.' As Mr. Lang says, 'Christ is to be reckoned divine as representing a king who was killed as an incarnation of a god,' but no proof is adduced, as far as Mr. Lang can see, that kings ever were killed because gods dwelt in them.

Thus far we have been concerned with the conjecture that when a god was resident in the body of a man, and the natural dissolution of that body was impending, a younger body was provided and the god somehow was induced to move from the one body to the other.

That conjecture is not yet supported by any single fact : no single instance of any case in which such transfusion or transmission is supposed to take place has been adduced. We are, however, now required by Mr. Frazer to believe that in Babylon the king originally was thus slain every year ; that in course of time a son of the king, or some other member of the royal family was substituted ; and that, finally, a criminal was made to take the place of this substitute. Mr. Lang's words on this matter are strong, but they do not seem to us to be too strong : ' Mr. Frazer asks us to suppose that any men of royal race, anywhere, men free and noble, not captives, not condemned criminals, would accept a crown, followed, in 365 days, by a death of fire ! A child knows that no men have ever acted in this way.' Any royal family would soon be used up at this rate of one per annum. ' No government could be carried on in the circumstances imagined by Mr. Frazer. The country would not stand it. No individual king would ever accept the crown. Human beings never had such a preposterous institution.' Not only is the thing impossible, ' the sacrifice is wholly without evidence.' And once more, this wholly imaginary sacrifice was, as Mr. Frazer suggests, carried on annually for countless years, and in one of those innumerable years the victim was Christ ; and to that fortuitous coincidence we owe the idea that Christ was divine. At the time of the Crucifixion and in Judæa it was of course not a king of Babylon nor any of his family who was sacrificed : substitutes had long been allowed, according to Mr. Frazer. But this custom of substitution is just as baseless and unproved as the original sacrifice of kings : ' not one single historical proof that there ever was such a custom is adduced.'

But though no case can be adduced in which an actual king (or substitute criminal) was sacrificed, one case is produced by Mr. Frazer which goes to prove the sacrifice of a mock-king. At the beginning of the Diocletian persecution, the soldiers in Lower Mœsia are said to have annually chosen one of their number to represent Saturn and be a mock-king for a month, at the end of which thirty days the soldier was to cut his own throat at the altar of Saturn. In A.D. 303 one Dasius, a Christian, was chosen but declined to act, and was ' knocked on the head ' (*ἐκρούσθη*) on November 20 in consequence.¹ The date of the Greek manuscript of this legend is the eleventh century, and that of the original text is conjectured to be the seventh century, or even A.D. 500-600. Dasius is represented to have recited the Nicene Creed in A.D. 303. The Saturnalia seem to be supposed by the writer of the legend to have lasted for a month : they really lasted, at most and latest, a week. Human sacrifice formed no part of the Saturnalia as celebrated in Italy, or as known to Roman antiquaries. If the legend of S. Dasius may be accepted as proof that a human sacrifice did form part of the Saturnalia as celebrated by Oriental soldiers in Mœsia, we are not warranted in inferring that it was part of the Roman feast—the

¹ *Analecta Bollandiana*, xvi. 5-16.

ignorance of Lucian and Macrobius would be inexplicable—the inference would rather be that in Mœsia, where alone it occurred, if it ever did occur, it was imported by the Oriental soldiers of the Roman Empire, who contaminated the Saturnalia with Oriental rites and sacrifices, and were encouraged or sanctioned in so doing by ‘the licensed ferocity of the persecutions under Diocletian.’ In any case, even if a human victim was sacrificed as the god Saturn on this occasion, there is no allegation that the god was supposed to have migrated from the body of the victim thus slain to the body of some other person in whom he was supposed to become incarnate. The ‘dying god’ may have been there; but no ‘risen god’ is producible, and both are equally necessary if Mr. Frazer’s theory is to work at all.

If we bear in mind that it is a sacrifice which Mr. Frazer’s theory requires, we shall have no difficulty about following Mr. Lang in rejecting the Sacæan victim produced by Mr. Frazer. At the festival called Sacæa, which was celebrated at Babylon in the month Lous, it was the custom for masters to be under the orders of their slaves; and in the royal household, the slave who impersonated the king, in this topsy-turvy feast, was called Zoganes. For this we have the authority of Athenæus, quoting Berosus, and the feast is also described by Strabo and Hesychius. But none of these authorities seems to be aware that the royal slave was executed. Mr. Frazer, indeed, says that ‘according to the historian Berosus, who, as a Babylonian priest, spoke with ample knowledge,’ the slave was hanged; but this is a slip. Berosus, speaking with ample knowledge doubtless, does not happen to have said so in any words transmitted to us. Our earliest authority for any such statement is Dio Chrysostom, who says that at the Sacæa one of the prisoners, condemned to death, is taken to lord it in the king’s household; and that at the end they strip, scourge, and crucify (or hang, *ἐκρέμασαν*) him. It is a doubtful point whether we can place much credence in this story, which, as Mr. Lang says, is ‘put into the mouth of a professed humourist,’ Diogenes, by Dio. But even if we accept it as historically true, it does not fulfil the conditions required: the slave, the mock-king of the Sacæa ‘is robed, and crowned, and scourged, but he is not sacrificed. We have no hint of a resurrection; none of a religious character attaching to the victim. The feast is traditionally a revel commemorative of a victory: the victim is a condemned criminal.’ Further, ‘to suit Mr. Frazer’s theory, the victim must not only have been divine at the origin of the institution, but must have been recognized as divine at the time of the Crucifixion of our Lord,’ for according to Mr. Frazer the ‘halo of divinity’ was thrust upon Him by the accidental fact that He was chosen to play the part of the ‘dying god’ in the drama which was celebrated annually both before and after the year of His Crucifixion.

Mr. Frazer started with the idea that primitive man, when he had a god resident in a mortal man, was anxious to keep him; and, for fear that the god should escape and be lost when the mortal tabernacle died, provided every year a more healthy person, into

whom he conveyed the god by killing the man in whom the god had hitherto dwelt. As Mr. Frazer admits, there is no instance known in which any such transference is supposed to take place; but there are various feasts or sacrifices which, according to Mr. Frazer, may be regarded as survivals of this supposed original transference of a god from one human frame to another. In none of these feasts or sacrifices, save the Crucifixion, does Mr. Frazer suppose that the original translation survives intact; but in all he claims that some *disiecta membra* of the original proceeding are still preserved. Thus, Purim celebrated the execution of Haman, and though Haman is not known to have been supposed to be a dying god, it is necessary for Mr. Frazer's hypothesis to assume that he was a god worshipped by the Jews. In the Tammuz feasts there was an effigy of the dead god, Tammuz or Adonis. At the Sacæa a criminal was (possibly) executed, but he seems to have been executed for his crimes, not sacrificed as, or supposed to have been, a god. In the Zakmuk there is not known to have been an execution or a sacrifice of a criminal, god, or anyone else; but there is a resemblance in the words 'Zakmuk' and 'Sacæa' which, though probably fortuitous, is enough to induce Mr. Frazer to identify them, and to ascribe to the one the proceedings which are stated (on insufficient authority) to have taken place at the other. To the seeing eye therefore of Mr. Frazer all these religious anniversaries, the Zakmuk, Sacæa, Purim, the Tammuz feasts, and even the Crucifixion itself, are one and the same thing: all are the same sacrifice, handed down from the earliest religious times, and having the same 'religious' object, viz. to transfer a god from one human body to another, so that he may never escape from his 'worshippers,' but always be subject to their control and subservient to their needs and purposes. Now if all these feasts or sacrifices are one and the same, though celebrated in different countries and by different nations, Mr. Frazer feels that they ought to be celebrated at one and the same time of year. Mr. Frazer therefore undertakes to argue that they were so celebrated. Mr. Lang argues that they were not. It is essential for Mr. Frazer's purpose of bringing the other rites into close connexion with the Crucifixion that he should fix the month of March as the time at which they took place. That was the time of Purim, and is fairly near the time of the Crucifixion, or, Mr. Frazer suggests, the Crucifixion may really have occurred at Purim. Mr. Frazer therefore has to fix the other rites or sacrifices in March also. With regard to the Tammuz festival it is not necessary to argue: as Mr. Lang says, 'the Tammuz feast was certainly in June-September.' The Zakmuk, in which no god or anybody else is known to have been sacrificed or killed, fell in our March-April. As to the Sacæa, in the first edition of the *Golden Bough* Mr. Frazer unhesitatingly accepted July as the date. In the second edition he sees, in his own words, that 'if the Sacæa occurred in July and the Zakmuk in March, the theory of their identity could not be maintained.' He therefore falls back on the uncertainty as to when the month Lous, the date of the Sacæa, really did fall: 'as

to the month Lous in particular the evidence of ancient writers appears to be conflicting, and until we have ascertained beyond the reach of doubt when Lous fell at Babylon in the time of Berossus it would be premature to allow much weight to the seeming discrepancy in the dates of the two festivals' (Zakmuk and Sacæa). But when Mr. Lang proceeds to inquire what the exact uncertainty with regard to the month Lous is, he finds, from Mr. Frazer's own references to Robertson Smith and to Smith's *Dictionary of Antiquities*, that the uncertainty is whether Lous fell in July, as Robertson Smith argued, or in September. 'So that the effort to make the Sacæa identical with Zakmuk, and therefore more or less coincident with Purim, and with our Easter, is an absolute failure.' And, as we have seen, the Tammuz feast fell in June-September. So of all the festivals which, according to Mr. Frazer, are and must be one and the same festival, no two coincide; and unless all coincide Mr. Frazer's theory of the Crucifixion breaks down. Mr. Frazer's theory is that the Crucifixion was but what took place one year at a religious ceremony which had been celebrated for countless years before and was celebrated for an uncertain number of years after the Crucifixion; and that the object of the ceremony was to transfer a god from one human body to another.

Mr. Frazer does not profess to be certain whether the Crucifixion took place at Purim, or, as the account of the Gospels makes it, a month after Purim. If it took place at Purim, then, for the purposes of his theory, it is necessary to show that at Purim the Jews 'may at one time have burned, hanged, or crucified a real man in the character of Haman;' and Mr. Frazer accordingly has 'some positive grounds' for thinking that a real man was annually so done to death. This positive evidence, however, resolves itself into the fact that in A.D. 416, after 'certain sports,' some Jews in Syria bound a Christian child to a cross and so ill-treated him that he died. Mr. Frazer has no evidence and also no doubt that the sports 'were Purim and that the boy who died on the cross was Haman.' The purpose of the Jews was 'to deride Christians, and even Christ Himself.' But, as Mr. Lang says, 'these motives did not exist before Christianity, so how does the anecdote of brutal and cruel mockery, ending in murder, afford "positive grounds" for the hypothesis that ever since the Exile, the Jews, in imitation of the Sacæan proceedings in July or September, yearly hanged a mock-king in March?' The anecdote of A.D. 416 does constitute, it must be confessed, poor evidence (and it constitutes all the 'positive grounds' for maintaining) that the Jews in pre-Christian times hanged a mock-king as Haman every year at Purim. Indeed, as Mr. Lang does not fail to point out, 'Mr. Frazer himself is so far from being convinced that the Jews hanged a man at Purim (*G.B.* iii. 172-174) as to suggest the supposition that they did not do so (*G.B.* iii. 189).' If they did not, then, as Mr. Lang says, Christ could not have been 'the Haman of a year, which it is Mr. Frazer's contention that He may have been.'

Finally, Mr. Lang calls attention to the essential incoherence and

mutual contradiction of Mr. Frazer's two incompatible views of the Crucifixion. On the one hand the death of Christ as the Haman of the annual mystery play of the dying god, according to Mr. Frazer, 'impressed upon what had been hitherto mainly an ethical mission the character of a divine revelation culminating in the passion and death of the incarnate Son of a heavenly Father. In this form the story of the life and death of Jesus exerted an influence which it could never have had if the great teacher had died the death of a vulgar malefactor. It shed round the Cross on Calvary a halo of divinity.'

On the other hand, only seventy-five pages before, Mr. Frazer had argued that even as early as the Sacæan festival it was as a vulgar malefactor and not as a god that the victim was killed :

'The divine character of the animal or man is forgotten, and he comes to be regarded merely as an ordinary victim. This is especially the case when it is a divine man who is killed. For when a nation becomes civilised, if it does not drop human sacrifices altogether, it at least selects as victims only such wretches as would be put to death at any rate. Thus, as in the Sacæan festival at Babylon, the killing of a god may come to be confounded with the execution of a criminal.'

The same fatal incongruity marks Mr. Frazer's treatment of Barabbas :

'By Mr. Frazer's theory Barabbas represented the re-arisen god, "the Son of the Father." Was Barabbas revered? No ; "some pretended to salute his mock majesty, and others belaboured the donkey on which he rode" (*G.B.* ii. 192). Therefore, by Mr. Frazer's own explicit statement, the divine facts about Barabbas were not recognized. Yet he was the counterpart of the sacred Victim.'

We cannot but rejoice that Mr. Lang has so promptly produced this searching criticism of Mr. Frazer's theory. We have but given a rough and inadequate idea of that criticism, and there is much else in *Magic and Religion* which will add to the respect and admiration felt for Mr. Lang both by those who are learned and by those who are not learned but only claim to be interested in this branch of the science of religion.

The Brahmo Samaj and Arya Samaj in their bearing upon Christianity. A Study in Indian Theism. By FRANK LILLINGSTON, M.A. (London : Macmillan and Co., 1901.)

THIS work, which is dedicated by the Rev. F. Lillingston to the Cambridge Brotherhood in Delhi, falls into two parts. In the first part the author gives us a short historical sketch of the development of monotheistic thought in India from the Vedas to the present time. In the second part he contrasts the monotheism of the Brahmo Samaj and Arya Samaj with the monotheism of Christianity. The first part, from the limited space within which it is condensed, is necessarily sketchy ; but something of the kind was plainly essential to a proper understanding of the Brahmo Samaj and Arya Samaj in their bearing upon Christianity ; and this part of Mr. Lillingston's work further has a value of its own, in that its references point out the proper line of reading for those who are called upon to pursue

the subject further. It is, however, in the second part of the work, in the examination of the doctrine of the two theistic societies whose names enter into the title of the book, that the interest and the merit of the essay are to be found. The investigation itself is primarily of importance to those who are, or may hereafter find themselves, brought into personal relation with these theistic societies or bound to be acquainted with their work and tendency; but the work is of interest to all to whom theology is a living thing. Without attempting to follow out the lines of Mr. Lillingston's examination, we may call attention to two or three points in it. He cites from the trust-deed of the first meeting-house of the Brahmo Samaj a declaration forbidding 'any direct or indirect attack upon opposing creeds.' This prohibition at once gives us an insight into the fundamental feebleness of the Brahmo Samaj and its necessary unfitness to survive. 'A religion,' Mr. Lillingston says, and the words deserve to be quoted, 'a religion that claims to be universal must, we think, be aggressive as well as contemplative; even amongst those who have become its adherents there must be many whose temptation to relapse into idolatry needs to be counteracted by the stern denunciation of the evil, as well as by the commendation of the good, and this not only in questions of morals, but also in questions of faith.' Throughout his criticism Mr. Lillingston rightly insists on the essentially subjective character of the faith of the Brahmo Samaj, and the fatal effects to which subjectivity leads in the world of action: 'such a subjective faith is destructive of all sense of responsibility.' He quotes the words of Mozoomdar: 'we deserve no credit for (the) existence (of our church), for its success, for its influence—neither do we deserve any discredit for the singularities, accidents and dangers that have befallen the Samaj at different times,' and Mr. Lillingston comments with penetration and with justice: 'man's "free-will" and consequent responsibility is implicitly denied.' It is obvious that there is an inner connexion between Mozoomdar's implicit denial of free-will and the purely contemplative, non-aggressive attitude enjoined by the founder of the Brahmo Samaj; and that both are the outcome of that subjectivity which is characteristic of Hindoo philosophy. That subjectivity pushed to its logical consequences yields the doctrine that all is illusion, Maya. Where that doctrine has settled into the soul, the conception of sin can hardly be formed. Mr. Lillingston thinks it 'probable that Rammohun Roy's shallow conception of sin was due to a tacit assumption of its derivation from Maya;' and though the Brahmo Samaj has reached a conception less shallow, it is wholly destitute of the idea that forgiveness of sin is necessary or even that such a thing is possible. What Mr. Lillingston says, pp. 91-95, on the subject of sin and the forgiveness of sins is admirable.

Synesius the Hellene. By W. S. CRAWFORD, B.D. (Rivingtons, London, 1901.)

It is a little unfortunate for Mr. Crawford that his very elaborate monogram on Synesius should have appeared three years after Pro-

fessor Dill's admirable book on 'Roman Society in the Last Century,' which was reviewed in these pages,¹ and which besides its own intrinsic high qualities had the advantage of a wider range and greater variety of subjects. Yet it may well be that the earlier work—of whose existence Mr. Crawford appears to be ignorant—has helped to renew the interest in the critical period when the versatile Greek philosopher and ecclesiastic flourished whose biography fills these ample pages. How the life of such a man as Synesius should be written must have been a problem which Mr. Crawford pondered anxiously before he decided upon the form into which his work should be cast. A man who combined in his own person the manifold characters of philosopher, scientist, poet, humorist, and ecclesiastic; whose literary productions include philosophical works, letters, rhetorical compositions, and hymns; and whose activities (despite his genuine preference for a life of retirement and learned ease) embraced in turn the pursuits of a sporting squire, the responsibilities of an ambassador to the imperial court, the energetic action of a local magistrate, and, to crown all, the arduous labour of a conscientious episcopate—such a man, of whom it might be said without any suggestion of insincerity,

‘That he seemed to be
Not one, but all mankind's epitome—’

affords a veritable crux for the skilful handling of a well furnished biographer. Mr. Crawford wisely, as we think, devotes a separate chapter to each phase of his hero's career, and in ten consecutive sections puts Synesius before us in the varied parts he played on life's shifting stage. An introductory sketch of the life precedes these delineations, which are followed by chapters on the friends and the works of Synesius, and all is concluded by a brief summary. To these are added no less than four appendices, containing (a) 'Five Letters of St. Isidore's,' (b) an excursus on the 'Sacramental Curtain,' and (c) on 'The Sacred Fire;' while the fourth gives us a very full catalogue of the quotations and literary allusions in the works of Synesius, printed in parallel columns, with the extracts to which they refer. The whole is completed by an Index which is more than usually indispensable in a work so replete with names and so varied in its subject matter.

It is obviously impossible within the limits of a short notice to give an exhaustive account of such a work, extending as it does in Mr. Crawford's hands over nearly six hundred pages. We cordially acknowledge and appreciate the great pains he has lavished on his subject, yet we cannot help thinking that he would probably have accomplished his object more effectually, and would have secured a larger circle of interested readers, if he had condensed and abbreviated his narrative more unsparingly. Modern students are not very tolerant of bulky volumes unless exceptional skill in narration and charm of style help to beguile their weariness, and Mr. Crawford's own style is singularly unequal, and occasionally quite unworthy

¹ See No. 91, April 1899.

of a serious historian. He perpetually indulges, *usque ad nauseam*, in the use of the phrase such a person or thing *seems* to be this or that: this unsatisfactory and halting form of assertion not unfrequently occurring several times in the same page. He interlards his paragraphs with slang terms, as *e.g.* 'the man in the street,' and even such vulgarisms as 'nice young man for a tea party,'¹ to express a *dilettante* in literature. Strangely enough, these blots meet us at the very moment when he is recording that Synesius 'disapproved of that most exasperating mark of many prolific authors, careless writing' (p. 174). Even more *exasperating*—if we may borrow Mr. Crawford's own caustic epithet—is the habitual allusion to Synesius as '*our worthy friend*,' or '*the worthy philosopher*,' as if he were an alderman of some country town depicted by the local newspaper reporter. Perhaps it may be thought more just to illustrate our criticism by letting a complete paragraph speak for itself, and we therefore select the following:

'Our friend was an eye-witness of the exciting circumstances summarized above (except the end of Gainas). He was a writer: he considered himself a poet. Surely he would give us a graphic description of the stirring scenes just represented? Oh, but, unfortunately he was also a philosopher and a bit of an antiquary! He had been living in Constantinople, but Alexandria was to him the finest city of the world. He was proud of being a Roman, but he was full of the mythology of Egypt. He set himself to work to relate what had occurred; and, lo, when we look for history we meet with fable; when we hope for an accurate account of facts, we receive a treatise on the instability of a kingdom not founded on righteousness. The *On Providence* is an interesting composition in itself and pleasant reading; but when we reflect how the making of history was proceeding by leaps and bounds during those few eventful months, we are tempted to be indignant with Synesius, and to ask him whether he supposes that men ought always to walk about with their heads in the air woolgathering to the top of their bent, and that the earth is not deserving of consideration. Perhaps it is well that such a question cannot be personally addressed to the worthy man' (pp. 28, 29).

If we pass from the manner to the matter of 'Synesius the Hellene' we find, as we might have expected, additional confirmation of the truth *Le style c'est l'homme*. The book is singularly unequal, and combines evidence of careful study with occasional indulgence in speculative fancy to serve for solid fact. Quotations and references are multiplied with microscopic particularity to establish the claim of the Hellene to be an adept in philosophy, literature, and science. His allusions to country pursuits and his eye for the charms of nature, his touches of humour and his skill as a *raconteur* of lively stories; his ignorance of Holy Scripture and his questionable orthodoxy; his unwillingness to accept the episcopate and his faithfulness in the discharge of its duties when once he had reluctantly undertaken them, are all most laboriously discussed with superabundance of extracts from the writings of Synesius in confirmation of every moot point. We have the most ample insistence on the

¹ Page 171.

obvious, and the fullest discussion of the unimportant. Page after page is replete with citation and argument which might well be relegated to swell the bulk of notes already of no mean dimensions. And when, after almost four hundred pages of what are rather *mémoires pour servir* than a well digested life, we come to a chapter of another fifty pages of 'the worthy man's' friends, many of whom are mere shadows, and some by the writer's own confession not friends of his at all—e.g. we read: 'At the head of a new set of friends (made at Constantinople) we place, on account of his importance, Anthemius, though we do not think that Synesius actually made his acquaintance' ! ! (p. 404)—we are tempted to lament that Mr. Crawford did not—to use Bishop South's words—'Take more time and write a shorter sermon.'

We are unfeignedly sorry to have so largely to qualify our commendation of a work on which so much pains has been bestowed. Despite the marvellous versatility of Synesius—or more probably in consequence of it—his career hardly deserved fuller treatment than it had already received in Mr. Halcombe's masterly summary in Smith and Wace's *Dictionary of Christian Biography*. We are almost tempted to think that Mr. Crawford's own estimate does not differ very widely from our own, and it is with but a faint protest that he quotes Kingsley's appreciation that Synesius was

'one of those many-sided, volatile, restless men, who taste joy and sorrow, if not deeply or permanently, yet abundantly and passionately . . . with a very clear practical faculty and a very muddy speculative one . . . whose detractors hinted, not without a show of reason, that he was far more of an adept in soldiering and horse-breaking than in the mysteries of the unseen world' (p. 349).

Dionysius of Halicarnassus. The Three Literary Letters. The Greek Text edited with English Translation, Facsimile, Notes, Glossary of Rhetorical and Grammatical Terms ; Bibliography and Introductory Essay on Dionysius as a Literary Critic. By W. RHYS ROBERTS, Litt. D., Professor of Greek in the University of North Wales. (Cambridge : at the University Press. 1901.)

THE title-page of this work, the whole of which we have not abstracted, reminds us a little of the opening of Macaulay's Essay on Dr. Nares's History, though it is not easy to see how it could have been compressed, if it was to describe with precision the contents of the volume, which is in itself a most welcome addition to the small number of editions that have been devoted by English scholars to the post-classical literature of Greece ; for, with the exception of the monumental work on Pausanias by Dr. Frazer, the admirable commentaries by the late Dr. Holden on several of the *Lives* of Plutarch, which have done so much to restore to that writer his former popularity, and the two volumes issued by the Clarendon Press of selections from Polybius and Strabo, edited respectively by Strachan-Davidson and Tozer, we can recall scarcely any other recent contributions of the kind published in this country to our

knowledge of the later Greek prose authors. Dr. Mahaffy justifies the exclusion of them from his *History of Greek Literature*, as meant for young students, on the ground that, as a rule, they are not read as classical, however valuable they may be for their matter, and even for their tone and sentiment. With regard to Dionysius, he admits indeed that he is necessary to any proper appreciation of classical oratory.

Professor Roberts has already earned the gratitude of all scholars by his edition of Longinus *On the Sublime*, and the present volume is an instalment of a series of studies on some specimens of the post-Alexandrian literature, to be carried out on a still larger scale. The object here aimed at by the editor is in some respects a unique one; for, as he says in his Preface, 'no sufficiently resolute and comprehensive effort seems yet to have been made to view Greek literature through the eyes of Greek critics.' After distinguishing the different points of view taken by Dionysius and Longinus, the former writer dealing mainly with questions of literary form and technique, the latter with moral nobleness, he proceeds in the following passage to make clear the scope of the present volume:

'The letters are interesting, and variously suggestive in themselves. But it is hoped that the present volume will also serve as a kind of general introduction to the entire body of extant critical work which we owe to Dionysius. In the Introductory Essay and in the Bibliography no pains have been spared to give full information, and abundant references, with the view of shedding light on all the literary essays of Dionysius; and in the Notes and Glossary a like effort has been made to illustrate his literary opinions and technical language by means of quotations from himself and other Greek critics. The task has been one of some difficulty, since no general introduction of the sort here offered, exists either at home or abroad, and no English translation of any of the literary essays of Dionysius has so far appeared' (Preface, p. viii).

The principal facts in the literary career of Dionysius are these: He came to Rome about the year 29 B.C. and remained there for twenty-two years. During all this period he devoted himself to the study of the Latin language and history, and to the collection of materials for his great work, the *Antiquitates Romanae*, or Early History of Rome, on which he believed erroneously that his reputation would rest. This he published in the year 7 B.C. in twenty books, of which the first nine and a few other fragments have survived. His profession was that of a teacher of rhetoric, and what vitiates so much of his History is the fact that he writes in the spirit of a Greek rhetorician. Its value is further impaired by the deliberate object with which it was composed, namely, to gratify his countrymen by removing their false impressions, showing that the Romans were not barbarians, but a pure Greek race, and tracing all the merit of the nation to this source. Its disproportionate minuteness and prolixity is sufficiently proved by the single fact that no less than *eleven* books are occupied with the subject contained in the first *three* of Livy. Niebuhr was more just to Dionysius than Macaulay, by whom he is

labelled as a 'tasteless' writer and a 'pedant.' Probably the general prejudice against Dionysius has been due in no slight degree to this sweeping condemnation of Macaulay, whose latest and most enthusiastic critic, Mr. Herbert Paul, admits that he sometimes 'overstated his case and was too much of his own opinion.' Dr. Roberts's estimate, however, of Dionysius is only indirectly connected with his work as an historian and an historical critic, on which he touches at the end of the fourth section of his Introductory Essay, where he says that, if some of his detailed criticisms of Thucydides are well founded 'others seem to show that Dionysius was greatly lacking in width of view and in historical perspective. He has, however, as has been (perhaps too piquantly) observed, cruelly expiated any injustice in his judgments on Thucydides by coming before the world as a historian himself' (p. 34).

It is to his literary criticism that Dionysius owes what fame he preserves, and the degree in which he is entitled to it is fully and impartially discussed by Dr. Roberts in his able Introductory Essay, wherein he deals first with other shorter and detailed writings of our author, chief among which is the *De Compositione Verborum*. In this, which contains a comparison between Herodotus and Thucydides, is illustrated the importance attached by Dionysius to the art of arrangement, and we are reminded of the story of the beginning of Plato's *Republic* mentioned by Dionysius (iii. 37) as well as by Quintilian,¹ how, in the author's tablets the opening words *κατὰ βῆν χθες εἰς Περσῶν* were found variously transposed.

He next proceeds to analyze the Three Literary Letters. These last we do not propose to speak of minutely, but will remark briefly upon each of them. The interest of the First Letter (*Ep. ad Ammæum I.*) consists in its chronological disproof of the assertion that Demosthenes had formed his style on and owed his success to the precepts of Aristotle's Rhetoric. The Second Letter (*Ep. ad Cn. Pompeium*, in which he explains the scope of his lost work, *De Imitatione*) illustrates the attitude of Dionysius towards Plato, and accordingly forms one of the most attractive portions of this volume. Dr. Roberts, in another connexion (p. 183), says that Dionysius, though technical, is anything but a pedantic writer. This is true. Nevertheless it is here we must plainly recognize his limitations, and we see what a wide difference there is between the critical and the imaginative faculty. The strictures on Plato, which, in spite of his respect for the great name of the philosopher, he permits himself to make, have regard chiefly to questions of style. We see, as we should expect, that he is insensible to his fine irony, and other subtle qualities. In truth, the soaring genius of a Plato refuses to be confined within the trammels of a technical literary critic.

The last of these three letters (*Ep. ad Ammæum II.*) is concerned chiefly with grammatical and linguistic topics, its subject being the peculiarities of Thucydides. This section is full of interesting and suggestive remarks to which we can but allude. Dr.

¹ *Instit. Or.* viii. 6.

Roberts concludes his Introduction with a discriminating sketch of the 'Relation of Dionysius as a literary critic to the Romans and Greeks,' and a general estimate of his aims and achievements. His knowledge of Latin literature was probably only general, and it is somewhat remarkable that he mentions neither Livy, nor Horace, nor Cicero. We see in him a man of independent judgment, robust common sense, solid research, and praiseworthy diligence, certainly not one who thought that easy reading ever came without hard thinking and patient labour, practising, moreover, himself the rules that he prescribed to others. His own style is eminently lucid and unaffected, and 'his true distinction as a critic,' Dr. Roberts asserts, 'is his purity of taste.' Nor should we forget that it is by him there have been preserved to us two of the gems of Greek poetry, the *Danae* of Simonides and Sappho's *Hymn to Aphrodite*. 'Vivid, graphic, and (we are tempted to say) modern' (p. 183), thus Dr. Roberts speaks of Dionysius. This somewhat strong language on a writer so little in fashion seems to be justified by the editor's 'Translation of the Three Letters,' of which we have as yet said nothing. The style in which they are rendered is eminently suited to the subject. It is that of the literary essayist or critic. It has been said that modern phraseology never conveys the exact meaning of a Greek writer, and as a rule this is true. But the works of this school of later Greek writers seem to form an exception. They stand on a different plane, and lend themselves to translation more than the great masterpieces. In some respects they are more readable than the original. We must not omit to mention with high praise the very interesting Glossary of Rhetorical and Grammatical Terms appended to this volume, the difficulty of which, as Dr. Roberts says, with truth, is far greater than any, who have not essayed the task of translation, can well imagine.

The execution of this book does great credit to the readers of the Pitt Press, to whose carefulness Dr. Roberts (p. ix) pays a well-merited tribute.

From the general excellence of the volume, and the high standard of scholarship maintained throughout, we look forward with great interest to the publication of the two other works promised in the preface—a *Critical Edition of Aristotle's Rhetoric* and a *History of Greek Literary Criticism*, by the same editor.

The Age of Decision. Sermons to Young Men. By P. N. WAGGETT, M.A., of the Society of St. John the Evangelist, Cowley St. John. (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1901.)

THE author of these thoughtful and striking addresses is evidently familiar with the causes which too often make youth a time of *indecision*. He repels the common notion that 'the man of chosen and bounden service, the man of accepted vocation,' finds life 'eventless, stereotyped, fixed in the lines of an arbitrary code.' That obedience to early visions and faithfulness to an accepted task opens to a man 'ever wider prospects of duty and ever freer enterprises of obedience;' that such a life 'cannot grow old, but in

God and in His service and love continually renews its youth'—this is the underlying thought of the whole book. Thus in dealing with certain aspects of personal religion Father Waggett insists that 'there is no alienation between the religion of the heart and the religion of the Church; between the awful claims of the body of Christ, and the interests of the individual soul.' He conceives of religion not merely as the apprehension of supernatural truth by the intelligence, but as the participation in a *Divine Life*. 'That which comes from God to us, and lifts us from earth to Him, is not a thought merely, but a powerful stream of forces and of love, a vast communication and endowment of realities, even the reality of the *Divine Life*.' The life of active service and devotion in the Catholic Church is at the same time bound to be a life of inward, intimate communion with Christ.

There is something in the pathetic and eloquent pleading of the following passage which reminds us of Ruskin's later tone and manner, though Father Waggett is pleading not so much for the diffusion of culture or for social reform as for a revival of religion :

'It is for you and for such as you to labour at the restoration, the revival of religion. . . . It is your task to restore its simplest elements : the worship and the fear of Almighty God. You have to restore these in our great desponding populations of London, in the vast cities, and in the desolate fields ; populations which are so burdened by the task of keeping body and soul together that they have no leisure and no heart for problems which do not seem to be concerned with the interests of their daily life. It is to these, by consolation, by encouragement, by leadership, by devoting the keenest powers to the consideration of their needs—it is to these your brethren, that you are to restore liberty of soul, that they may rise up and claim their heritage in God. It is for you to make the Empire Christian ; it is for you to render politics once again a deep and powerful stream of life, containing in itself a real debate, having in it real parties, real conflicts, enough strength to provide an Opposition as well as a Ministry. It is for you to purify the literature and the stage of the country. . . . It would seem, from what we hear, that in spite of much which is noble and true in some quarters there was never greater need for discrimination than now, and in certain directions for the gravest rebuke. But instead of rebuke we have the silence of the wise and the apathy of the pure. . . . Since all this lies with you, and so much more, . . . see to it that in your time of formation you make strong resolves and lay clear plans, that you do not waste and squander that precious youth which is the only power under God by which, through grace and faith, these works can be attempted.'

On three subjects especially Father Waggett speaks with great insight and force. In his second address he describes faith as the temper of 'mutual confidence' between two spiritual beings. Confidence is the root from which springs the generosity and joy of a living faith in God—such faith as is the one secret of moral and spiritual power. The next address deals with truthfulness of character as the condition of spiritual insight : and incidentally the author touches on the subject of Confession. 'Confession,' he says, 'is not a Popish thing, or a High Church thing, or a mystical,

fanciful thing. It is simply an honest thing. It is a way of being honest, of dealing the truth in love, of being delivered from a false position and a miserable state of pretence.' This, as it seems to us, is the wisest way of commending the practice of Confession to those who need it. 'It is an honest thing,' a way of recovering inward truth and sincerity, 'by which,' as Father Waggett says, 'we are restored into the full honesty and happiness of dear sons.' In his fifth address he deals with the subject of vocation, and his teaching is specially helpful and encouraging to those who have never properly understood, or at least never practically experienced, the truth of vocation. In one suggestive passage the preacher points out the reason why 'God does not always choose men according to natural fitness.' 'A society,' he says, 'in which fitness ruled position would lack movement.' 'The safe course is for each man to go where he is *sent*, according to a judgment and a scheme which are outside his information altogether.'

The other addresses (including one preached in substance at Charterhouse on Founder's Day) do not call for any special comment. We feel inclined to suggest that Father Waggett's powers of reflection and insight fit him peculiarly for the devotional exposition of the Bible; and we hope he may be induced to turn his attention in this direction. His scientific training, of which abundant traces appear in this book, would be an added qualification for such work.

Prospice. Sermons preached in Clifton College Chapel. By the Rev. M. G. GLAZEBROOK, M.A. (London: Rivingtons, 1900.)

THIS is a rather exceptional volume of school sermons, marked not only by masculine force and originality, but by an imaginative and poetical vein of thought, which gives a peculiar attractiveness to the treatment of even commonplace subjects. Perhaps the most striking sermon is that on 'Education,' which we should like specially to commend to all who are charged with the mental training of the young. Canon Glazebrook follows Aristotle in regarding the 'educated' man as the man who can reason rightly, and nothing could be better than his description of right reasoning. The following is a typically good passage:

'Secondly, a man must be able to see the force of objections. . . . You many have learned to follow an argument step by step, and yet be quite unable to deal with an objection, or even to see whether it has real force or not. This is to be under the influence of prejudice. Probably no man ever attains such perfect fairness of mind, such entire freedom from prejudice, that he can do full justice to the arguments on both sides of every question. . . . Here again the training of school is a training for life. When you are discussing the date of some ancient battle or the authorship of some ancient book, the issue which is really at stake is not merely your opinion upon that question, but your power in the future to judge fairly between opposing interests, or to sacrifice your own prejudices to the truth, or your own claims to the rights of others.'

And elsewhere a 'trained mind' is described as 'one that can endure fatigue, can adapt itself quickly to a new subject, can observe and

reason and remember.' For 'the popular cry about useful knowledge' the preacher has scant respect. 'Knowledge,' he says, 'is useful in itself, but the chief use of learning in youth is to develop the judgement, upon which the conduct of life depends.'

These extracts are characteristic of the sane and broad-minded teaching which pervades Canon Glazebrook's sermons. He seems to realize keenly the extent to which wrong ideals of education have acted disastrously on national character. The sermon on 'The Intellectual Side of Patriotism' is specially interesting in this connexion. Preaching in January 1900, when the nation was passing through a period of special despondency after recent disasters in South Africa, he points out that 'our shortcomings have been mainly intellectual.' Not only the conduct of the war, but the interests of commerce, of literature, and even of religion itself, have suffered from 'the unwillingness of our people to admit new ideas.' The weakness of the age is a certain dislike of 'the serious toil which thoroughness of any kind demands.' . . . 'The cry is always for something practical, as it is called—that is, concrete, material, anything but spiritual.'

Here again is a fine and inspiring sketch of an ideal public school :

'We all at some time have seen a vision of Clifton as a perfect brotherhood, where confidence reigns between all its members, young and old ; where the strong compulsion of love has power by itself to drive out every form of falsehood and vice ; where no evil tongues invent or circulate rumours ; where each works for all with his full strength ; where each brother is growing, not only in stature, but in wisdom and in the fear of God, because the atmosphere is charged with high thoughts and pure desires. We picture this our home as a garden of the Lord, whose trees are full of health and sap, ready when they are planted out in the world to be an ornament and a shelter for men.'

Throughout these striking and suggestive sermons Canon Glazebrook seems to us to rely with true insight on the capacity of young minds to 'see visions.' He steadily keeps in view and holds before the boys a picture of what they may become ; he fixes their thoughts upon the needs of the time, and upon the various ways in which each of his present hearers may play his future part in the uplifting of their fellows and the enrichment of their country. This is the moral very happily drawn from the text (1 Sam. xxx. 24), 'As his share is that goeth down to the battle, so shall his share be that tarrieth by the stuff.'

'The text,' says Canon Glazebrook, 'bids you remember that you are the reserves—not for this [the present South African] war—but for the wars of ten, or twenty, or thirty years on. You are, so to speak, guarding the stuff—that is, the manhood of England in years to come ; and . . . if you are storing up strength of body, and mind, and will, if you are training character and gaining knowledge, then you are building up the England of the future, which is the hope of the present. Thirty years hence you and your contemporaries will be the main power in the country,

and what you will desire to do and be able to do then must depend in a great measure upon the use you make of your time now.'

We have said and quoted enough to show that this is no ordinary volume of school sermons, but a wise and powerful plea for a bolder and broader conception of education than is at all widely diffused nowadays. It may be added that a deep tone of reverence and true spirituality is apparent in all the sermons—especially, perhaps, in those on 'Prayer,' on 'The Sense of Sin,' and on 'The Psalms.' The last deserves to be compared with Dean Church's more elaborate essay on the same theme. Canon Glazebrook has a keen sense of the educational value of the Psalter—its capacity to mould, purify, and elevate religious feeling. Both in this sermon and in that on the 'Prayer Book' he points out with equal simplicity and force the true value of liturgical forms as an element in spiritual education. We should like to refer to several passages of real poetical beauty in these sermons, but our space only admits of the general comment that Canon Glazebrook's style is throughout worthy of the vivid and inspiring teaching which gives a rare distinction to this little volume.

Schoolboys' Special Immorality. By M. HIME. (London: Churchill, 1899.)

It is a commonplace among those who have charge of boys that the subject with which Dr. Hime deals in this book is one of singular intricacy and difficulty. It goes down into the very depths of human nature, and concerns certain aberrations of the human will at a time of life the most inarticulate, the most inscrutable of all—the time of the passing from childhood to manhood. Moreover, the nature of the evils under consideration is not more obscure than the effect of various remedies which have been proposed, and concerning which great variety of opinion exists. It is, in short, a subject under some aspects solemn and awful, but capable of the utmost triviality and offensiveness of treatment. In no subject is competent guidance more urgently needed, and in none are crude prescriptions more dangerous. Thus in any adequate treatment of it we ask first for knowledge of boys derived from long experience and insight into character; then for delicacy of language and lucidity; then for manly common sense, untinged by cynicism, but kindled by strong religious principle; then for firmness in the tracing of cause and effect; but perhaps more than all for a certain reverent agnosticism with regard to some of the symptoms of perversion in boy nature, and a freedom from all cant and exaggeration. Some of these requirements Dr. Hime's book fulfils; but in respect of the last there is much to be regretted in his pages. We will select a few of the more prominent instances.

On p. 16 there is a very misleading classification of headmasters into two groups, the one consisting of those who talk and write about immorality more definitely than Dr. Hime himself, and 'hundreds' of others who sinfully ignore the evil altogether. The truth is that the mass of headmasters belong to neither section.

They do not ignore the evil, nor do they speak about it, but patiently and quietly combat it. Then Dr. Hime tilts heavily against the system of cubicles. If half of what he says were true, schools in which this system obtains would be not only hotbeds of vice, but of physical ill-health as well. A sentence like the following inspires the reader with a deep distrust of Dr. Hime's judgment: 'For the promotion of schoolboys' special vice there could not possibly be a more effectual school arrangement than cubicles.' And yet schools in which there are cubicles are, generally speaking, just as wholesome as others where there are none, and it is well known that authorities quite as well qualified as Dr. Hime differ wholly from him as to this point.

But perhaps the most annoying exaggeration often to be found in writing about boys is in the tone adopted on the subject of smoking. Dr. Hime says (p. 24): 'On the injury done to the *morale* and to the still growing brain and growing body of a boy by tobacco I need not dwell, neither need I dwell on the sneaking, underhandedness . . . inseparable from indulgence at school of the forbidden weed.' To say nothing of the slipshod English, where is the evidence for the statement that smoking injures the *morale* of boys or their physical health? There are obvious disciplinary reasons why smoking at school should be checked; but the common and unproveable assumption that even in moderation it stimulates dishonesty, stunts the growth, and spoils the memory is a very silly and tiresome piece of cant. Is smoking at schools dishonest only because it is a breach of rules? If so, why not all kinds of disobedience? If, on the other hand, it is dishonest in itself, why is it so perfectly innocent a practice in manhood? And, again, if it is fatal to physical health, growth, digestion, memory, &c. in boyhood, the splendid health of many young men who smoke regularly is a miracle.

Dr. Hime believes in constant supervision of boys by masters in playhours, and implies (p. 30) that the chief reason for its non-adoption is that it is expensive. This reason in many schools has nothing whatever to do with the matter. The objection to constant supervision is the instinct deep in the English heart that the training for manhood is more wholesome if the presence of adults is only intermittent. And the dilemma on p. 33 is a false one, and seems to show that the author has no understanding of the prefect system. When mischief among young boys is frowned upon by older ones, the former believe in the genuineness of the disapprobation and learn to hate evil. When the only check comes from masters, the common conventional boy looks on this as an interference which he may tolerate, but can never approve. It is merely professional zeal. We admit that in grammar schools where there are no boys over seventeen years, the prefect system is hardly possible, but Dr. Hime strangely condemns it where it is possible.

On p. 51 our author again is sadly one-sided in his confident assertion that no sort of reading should be allowed in the regular playhours, but should be confined to the holidays. This is athleticism run mad. Perspiration is a good thing, but many boys have

risen to eminence through being allowed to subordinate it to literature in the days of their youth.

The usual homage is paid to the cold bath, ending with a reference to one of the falsest maxims ever spoken, that 'cleanliness is next to godliness.' Some of the most vicious boys at school or at home have been physically the cleanest, and there is no certain connexion between washing the limbs and subduing the passions.

We are glad to find that (p. 62) Dr. Hime strongly condemns the system of reticence still far too common among parents. But so far as we understand him, he advocates only an emphatic warning against vice, but has no words too strong to pour contempt on carefully graduated instruction in laws of sex and birth. In no part of the subject is there more need of an enlightened and judicial mind. But Dr. Hime does not seem to be aware that anyone has written on this subject before, and in a sense quite contrary to his own. He derides instruction, but contends hotly for warning. But why should there not be both? And why should it be assumed that the instruction is of the sort jeered at by Dr. Hime on p. 70? We venture to say that his attitude towards this question of instruction betrays the most lamentable ignorance of the deeper parts of the subject.

We should be inclined to think that the attitude of headmasters towards this evil which is denounced in the chapter on Expulsion is a thing of the past, though there is doubtless a lingering belief that to get rid of a bad boy is the same as securing that a good boy takes his place. The belief is a foolish one undoubtedly, and we hold that Arnold's example in this matter has been followed by headmasters with a deplorable want of discrimination. But does any headmaster believe in expulsion by itself? Probably not. On this subject, however, we think Dr. Hime's language is on the whole justified. But in his treatment of corporal punishment there is again no recognition of the deeper truths underlying the subject, only a rash positiveness which repels even a reader who agrees with the conclusions. And once more we have to ask, why slay the slain? Is there a single schoolmaster in the United Kingdom who looks on caning as a remedy for this vice?

More might be said on the concluding pages; but we must sum up by expressing our sense of a great deal of honest zeal manifested in these pages, while we deplore the superficial and rhetorical treatment of an obscure and solemn subject. The book is spoilt by dogmatism, often divorced from knowledge.

The Faith of the Millions. A Collection of Past Essays. By GEORGE TYRRELL, S.J. First and Second Series. (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1901.)

THIS is a very attractive book. Its style is brilliant and epigrammatic, its tone gentle and charitable. In the places where the Anglican position is attacked in the most uncompromising way we have never to charge the writer with either unkindness or unfairness. If every Roman controversialist would but write in the spirit of Father Tyrrell,

Canon Gore might withdraw his assertion that 'we have ceased almost to hope to find in a modern Roman writer a candid review of the whole facts of a case where the Roman claims or dogmas are in question.' But indeed the Anglican position is not the primary objective of Father Tyrrell's controversial writings. He considers that 'the tidal wave of unbelief whose gathering force bids fair to sweep everything before it' calls more loudly for efforts on his part, and on that of his co-religionists, than the attempt to complete for Anglo-Catholics the work which, from his point of view, has been already half effected by the Tractarians and their present-day successors.

The scope of the book, then, as a whole, is constructive rather than controversial. From the Essays in the First Series, especially from the two on Mysticism, from that on Scholasticism and that on Rationalism in Religion, it is not difficult to see that the writer has elaborated for himself a very simple and consistent philosophy to serve as a handmaid to the Faith. His Theology dovetails into his Philosophy so as to form, along with it, a system of Apologetics which might be thrown into a concise and attractive whole. But few readers of the book will take the trouble which we have taken of tracing out the method which pervades the various Essays, and piecing it into a system. If the writer himself would throw his strength for a time into welding all that he has thought out into a systematic and constructive treatise, we venture to say that not only the Roman Catholic, but the entire religious world, would be placed under a great obligation to him. Whatever claim to originality such a treatise on Apologetics might have, it would have those merits of clearness and winningness and, above all, of perfect readableness which would recommend it to the very class of people who require to be helped on such lines. For, with one somewhat notable exception, which has jarred on us in reading this book, the writer shows throughout that he is in touch with the intelligent thought of people who do not read much. The single exception we have to note is a passage where he goes out of his way to be sarcastic about the very class of people whom he is taking such trouble to reach. Surely the grocer or the sempstress whose derangement of their aspirates he laughs at are not more likely to be won for his deserting in a single passage the sympathetic, tactful treatment which he accords to them everywhere else.

But we will allow him to enunciate for himself the philosophical faith which is in him, confining ourselves to piecing it together, as we have gleaned it from separate passages, with a necessary link or two supplied.

He is well aware that the practical Briton is shy of categories and abstractions. But practical or unpractical, thoughtful or stolid, a Philosophy in some shape he must have. For, 'there is a philosophy, nay, a metaphysics, implied in the common language of the rudest savage or the simplest child. It is not only the Gospel according to St. John, but the Sermon on the Mount, which depends for its intelligibility on a presupposed philosophy.'

Some sort of categories of thought thus underlying the simplest operations of the mind, as such, 'every new simplification of knowledge, by which the incoherent many is seen to be one and connected, delights the mind, and gives it a moment of ecstatic rest' which makes it 'evident that the mind has an ineradicable craving for some vision in which the totality of truth shall be summed up in the most absolute simplicity and unity of being.' In that growth of knowledge which we sum up under the name of experience we find that 'in some sense all experience and teaching but wakes us to a consciousness of our spiritual self. . . . In revealing to us, day by day, our latent capacities of knowing and loving, life reveals us to ourselves, so that the knowledge of self and not-self go hand in hand. Yet what delights us without is divided and imperfect; what delights us within is united and perfect. In this way the spirit is the microcosm, a pure white light, unaware of its own beauty till it sees it scattered into its components by the prism of creation.'

This is the core and the keynote of Father Tyrrell's Philosophy—the indivisibility of the cognition of self and not-self, the relativity of knowledge, in the sense that we ourselves condition not only ourselves but our universe; that we know both in an indivisible act of intuition; that our unconscious categories of thought are there, whether we like it or no; and that philosophy means simply the attempt to find an ultimate unification in thought for the One and the Many which in fact and experience have ever presented themselves to us in an unconscious, inevitable unity. Philosophize we must and do in some form or another, for 'so far as we have leisure and culture our reason sifts and analyses these multitudinous assents' by which, for the most part through unconscious inference, we have ever been educating ourselves, 'rejects what is spurious and worthless, classifies and orders the remainder, always tending to some comprehensive unification of all our knowledge into one organic whole. So far as this last tendency is conscious and reflex, we may be said to be in quest of a philosophy; but even where reason in any way begins to work on the gathered materials of thought, there is an unconscious groping after this same unity.'

But necessary though this classification, ordering, unifying of knowledge may be, it needs to be ever corrected by recurrence to the ordinary common-sense methods of experience. And the wise man of balanced mind, the wise *orbis terrarum* which ultimately finds for philosophy and philosophers their true level and worth, and sits, safe, in judgment upon them, is ever bearing it in mind, that 'the world at large refuses to be harnessed to our categories, and goes its own rude, unscientific way.' It is 'the exigencies of our own feeble and limited memory which make it necessary to classify our experiences into some sort of unity,' as we classify books in a library. All the same, philosophy is real as far as it goes. Just as we find, not make, the differences and resemblances by which we class the books in a library or the beetles in a museum, so, 'when we map out the world into categories, we do not invent but recognise one or other of these arrangements things admit of.' And

provided that we do not treat our categories as an end in themselves, but as a corrective to the vagueness of experience, so long our philosophy is in its proper place. And, again, so long as we do not treat experience as the be-all and end-all, but recognise that the unifying instinct is a real and an inevitable one, the two kinds of knowledge, the vulgar and the scientific, supplement each other according to the needs of each. 'Both kinds of knowledge are in their way lamentably imperfect, the one'—that of the backwoodsman who has a vivid but inexact knowledge of nature—'through indistinctness and confusion, the other'—that of the scientist who should think of beetles as 'marching the fields in logically ordered phalanxes, with pins thrust through their middles—through unreality and poverty of content.'

Philosophical thought, then, is for the things of this world, not only inevitable to our intelligence, but useful to our practice, as reducing all our knowledge to an ordered synthesis and unity. But even here 'it is clear that, as far as the natural world is concerned, what is scientifically true in the abstract may be practically false in the concrete. But when we are dealing with the spiritual and supernatural world we are under a further disadvantage, for we can think and speak of it only in analogous terms borrowed from this world of our sensible experience, and with no more exactitude than when we would express music in terms of colour, or *vice versa*. Yet in all the reaching out of the mind after that unification of knowledge which is the motive and the basis of its philosophising, that which it 'really, though often unconsciously, craves for is the vision of the Eternal Mind, which alone can evoke and fill to infinite overflowing its utmost capacities of knowing and loving, and thereby fully reveal it to itself: "*In lumine tuo videbimus lumen*," as the mystics say.' With a twofold craving, then, of heart and understanding, the soul aspires towards Him who is at once the '*Ben dell' intelletto*,' and the Supreme Object of affection. Its very Philosophy demands a Theology, if it is ever really to be satisfied. For in truth, that experience by which, as enunciated above, we learn to know ourselves, and by knowing ourselves to work upward to a unification of all knowledge and experience, 'is but a means to another and better conception through which the mind brings forth in itself an idea, or image, or word of God, in the contemplative love of which it finds its best and most unselfish happiness.' Nor is this upward tendency on man's part left without response on the part of Him towards Whom it is directed. For, 'as God cares how we live, how we use our senses, our passions, our members, our will, and other faculties, so He also cares about the perfection of our intelligence, and about the life of thought for its own sake.' This, then, makes it reasonable and hopeful that men should care 'to know about God' as far as God might allow them, however imperfect that knowledge might be.' For imperfection, due to the limitation of our faculties, is the worst charge which can be brought against the Church's theological formulæ. 'Although the truths of faith are believed to be objectively one, and linked together, yet to our gaze they are

but as
legitim
their
jectur
one a
'the C
revela
all; n
only t
intellig
enshri
from
Divine
very n
the re
the ob
we ca
object
where
meddl
phoric
bulk o
are 'c
judice
conser
Papac
past .
begin
religio
as dis
bility
of gu
organ
it is i
that t
Theol
uncon
pervad
divine
have
public
Christ
cated.
creati
comm
day w
sality,
'a m
than
philos

but as the projecting mountains of a submerged continent. It is a legitimate exercise of reverent reason to mark any indications of their hidden unity, to observe their angles of inclination, and to conjecture the point at which some of them may meet below and run into one another.' While, therefore, the catholic Christian knows that 'the Gospel is partly intelligible, partly unintelligible; on one side revelation, light, on the other mystery and darkness. Faith takes it all; rationalism takes the intelligible part alone.' But faith takes not only the truths themselves, so far as they can be grasped by our intelligence, but even the very words and phrases in which they are enshrined, as something which may not be altered or abandoned from time to time. 'The words and ordinances in which those Divine truths were couched might not be tampered with, just for the very reason that they did not, and could not, correspond exactly to the reality which they half hid and half disclosed. When we know the object presented under a metaphor, and the exact point of parity, we can safely change that metaphor for another; but when the object is known only through and in the metaphor, we do not know where the correspondence begins or ends, and so cannot afford to meddle.' The Church, then, recognizing the inadequacy and metaphorical character of her symbols, and knowing also that the great bulk of most men's beliefs and principles, on all subjects whatever, are 'caused in them' by authority of some sort—are, in fact, prejudices, not reasoned convictions—has established 'an international consensus,' brings—Father Tyrrell of course says by means of the Papacy—'the collective mind of the present Church, built upon the past . . . the social influence of the whole Christian body, from the beginning, to bear upon the mind of the individual, and to shape its religious beliefs.' This constitutes that element of Divine Assistance, as distinguished from direct Revelation, by which 'ultimate infallibility' is secured. 'Even apart from such intervention, the security of guidance offered by such an ancient, world-wide, close-knit organism would be considerable—although it may be fairly held that it is in the very creation and continuance of this religious republic that the hand of God is most felt.' The Church, then, will have a Theology not to be tampered with. And, since the categories, the unconscious, underlying assumptions of all human thinking, must pervade all our thoughts upon all possible subjects, human and divine, if the Church is to have a Theology, she must, in some sort, have a Philosophy as well; must, at any rate, have 'some sort of public philosophy,' certain regulative canons or categories for all Christian thinking, 'whereby the very notion of faith may be vindicated.' As a fact, she found these ready to her hand, at a great creative period, in the Scholastic System. And so far as she has committed herself to that system it is because, just as Latin in that day was a 'word-language which had a sort of territorial universality,' so Aristotelianism, as taken up by the School-men, constituted 'a mind-language which had attained an universality even wider than that of the Latin or Greek tongue, which was professedly the philosophy of common sense and common language; which, by

reason of its child-like directness and simplicity, departed as little as possible from the fundamental conceptions common to all philosophies, and in this philosophy she determined to embody her dogmas, leaving it to those who should care to do so at their own risk, to translate them from the mind-forms of Aristotle into the mind-forms of other thinkers, *salva substantia*.' So long as they are kept in the scholastic forms she guarantees them; translated into others, she may tolerate, but she does not answer for them.

There are many other subjects in these delightful Essays which we should like to present to our readers, but this summary has run far beyond what we contemplated in beginning it, and the body of thought which it inadequately sets forth is quite the most valuable portion of Father Tyrrell's book.

The book itself is beautifully got up. But we are sorry to have to add that it needs a table of *Errata*.

Space forbids our giving more than one or two instances of the happy, epigrammatic point of the author's style. Let the following suffice:

'In practical matters, the reasons men give for their conduct, to themselves or others, are often untrue, never exhaustive. Hence to refute their reasons will not alter their intentions.'

'The pompous parades of syllogistic arguments with all their unsightly joints sticking out for public admiration.'

'It was not the crowds of Pagandom that St. Paul censured, but the philosophers. God made man's feet for the earth, not for the tight-rope. Whatever be the truth about Idealism, man is by nature a Realist: and similarly he is by nature a Theist, until he has studiously learnt to balance himself in the non-natural pose.'

But why, we must ask in conclusion, does an author who can write like this blemish his book by introducing such expressions as 'to extravagate,' 'to ambition,' 'to precise'? And why does he call grace 'an illustration of the mind,' when he means an illumination.

Revelations of Divine Love, recorded by Julian, anchoress at Norwich, 1373. Edited by GRACE WARRACK. (London: Methuen, 1901.)

THE *Revelations* of Julian (or Juliana) of Norwich is beyond doubt one of the most attractive specimens of mediæval devotional literature. It ranks with Hilton's *Scale of Perfection*, which was written about the same time, as a beautiful example of English mysticism in the century which produced Tauler and Suso in Germany, and it has a peculiar interest of its own in the charming personal touches in which it abounds. The editor is fully justified in attributing to Julian

'depth of passion, with quietness, order, and moderation; loyalty in faith, with clearest candour; pitifulness and sympathy, with hope and blithe serenity; sound good sense with a little sparkle upon it, as of delicate humour (that crowning virtue of saints); and beneath all, above all, an exquisite tenderness that turns her speech to music' (p. xxxi).

The reader who expects to find in this anchoress the harsh asceticism and gloomy austerity of such cloister mystics as St. John of the

Cross will be surprised by the geniality and brightness of her outlook upon time and eternity. Her own account of the 'meaning' of her visions is as follows:

'From the time that the revelation was shewed I desired oftentimes to learn what was our Lord's meaning. And fifteen years afterwards and more, I was answered in ghostly understanding, saying thus: Wouldest thou learn thy Lord's meaning in this thing? Learn it well; Love was His meaning. Who shewed it to thee? Love. What shewed He thee? Love. Wherefore shewed it He? For love. Hold thee therein and thou shalt learn and know more in the same. But thou shalt never know nor learn other thing without end.'

Even sin, which, she believed, 'has no manner of substance nor any part of being,' 'purgeth and maketh us to know ourself,' and so is 'behovable.' 'All shall be well and all shall be well,' she repeats like a refrain, when the problem of evil threatens to weigh her down. Julian disclaims book learning, but she must have talked with divines who had read as well as thought. Her psychology includes the 'Substance' or 'Ground' which plays so important a part in mystical theology, and occasionally we find sentences which have an Eckhartian ring. But she never strays into speculation; she tells us only what was 'shown' her, and qualifies every bolder statement with 'as to my sight.' The little book teems with sayings which deserve to be pondered over—e.g. 'To me was shewed no harder hell than sin'; 'I understood no higher stature in this life than childhood'; 'It is readier to us to come to the knowing of God than to know our own soul'; 'God is the mid point of all things'; 'Prayer oneth the soul to God'; 'Our Lord said to me, I am the ground of thy beseeching. How then should it be that thou shouldest not have thy beseeching?' 'The love wherein we have our beginning was without beginning; and this we shall see in God without end.'

Miss Warrack has executed her task with taste and judgment. Her appreciative introduction tells us all that is known about Julian, and gives as much information about mystical theology as is necessary in order to enjoy the book. She has been probably well advised in adopting modern spelling, with such slight exceptions as 'shew,' which is rather old-fashioned than obsolete. Those who love Old English will perhaps wish that she had altered nothing else in the text, and had been content to explain difficulties in the foot notes; but the modernizing has been very slight, and the antique charm of Julian's language is almost unimpaired. Many readers will, we hope, be grateful to Miss Warrack for her labour of love in introducing them to this gem of Old English sacred literature.

An Introduction to Christian Mysticism. By ELEANOR C. GREGORY.
(London: H. R. Allenson, 1901.)

This is a paper read before the Portsmouth Ladies' Society. It is taken mainly from the *Bampton Lectures* of 1899, from which several quotations are made. The writer has also found room for a fine extract from *John Inglesant*, and for a paragraph from one of Canon

Scott Holland's sermons. Her definition of Mysticism as 'the science of a hidden life' is better than most of the definitions which have been collected from other writers, and her little essay is well calculated to awaken interest in the subject.

The Eucharistic Sacrifice. A Charge delivered to his Clergy, by the Right Rev. CHARLES C. GRAFTON, S.T.D., Bishop of Fond du Lac. (Fond du Lac: P. B. Haber Printing Company, 1901.)

THE acceptance of the Scotist theory that the Son of God would have become incarnate even if man had not sinned leads the Bishop of Fond du Lac in this Charge to regard the purpose and effect of the Incarnation as extending to the whole of the created universe, not simply to man and our own planet. He describes sacrifice as necessary to religion, as having existed in Eden in the form of man offering up to God the tree of knowledge by abstaining from it, as involving death after the fall, and as found in the sacrifice of the cross, with its four aspects of praise, thanksgiving, prayer, and propitiation. He then asserts the identity of the sacrifice of the altar with that of Calvary, calls attention to the existence in the Eucharist of the four aspects described as found on the cross, points out that the Eucharistic sacrifice does not detract from the sufficiency of what Christ did in His death, and refers to the relation of the Eucharist to the sacrifice in heaven in the following words:

'In heaven Christ as ever a High Priest must have somewhat eternally to offer, and Holy Scripture declares what that offering is, when He is seen there as the Lamb of God. If the essence of sacrifice is an actual or mystical immolation, then there is no sacrifice in heaven. But if sacrifice is the law of the creature's relation to God, wherever he may be, then the worship of heaven must express that law. It may be objected that sacrifice is an act; that the sacrifice on Calvary was an act; that each Eucharist is an act; but that the oblation of Christ in heaven is a state, and hence cannot be a sacrifice. But it is not with God or our Lord as with us creatures. We must either be in action or repose. It is not so with God. As cause, rightly understood, connotes the two ideas of action and finality or rest, so it is with the great First Cause. God is at once unceasing Activity and Eternal Rest. So it is with our Lord. He abides in the passionless tranquillity of the Eternal Life, yet His Saints will follow the Lamb in all the marvellous developments of His majestic operations wherever He goeth. He Who is at once Action and Repose is the Priest and Oblation in the Glory of the Blessed Trinity. The Sacrifice of the Altar is one with that in Glory because it is the same oblation. But may we not see there the same fourfold aspects of sacrifice that are to be found in every dispensation? In heaven there will be the greater need of offering a sacrifice of praise. Not only for creation and redemption, but for Glory must we offer also a sacrifice of thanksgiving. The sacrifice of prayer will ever be needed for our Communion with God, and still, should we not ever need the sacrifice of propitiation? for in His sight the very heavens are not clean, and it must ever be ours to be accepted "in the Beloved." Thus the Church of Christ, by Christ her Head, shall ever present and offer Christ, and through Christ receive the gifts of God, which can never come to an end because He is infinite' (pp. 17-19).

Fond du Lac Tracts. No. 2. The Holy Eucharist in the New Testament. By the Bishop of Fond du Lac. (Milwaukee, Wis.: The Young Churchman Co., no date.)

THIS tract is a simple and reverent exposition of the passages in the New Testament which refer to the Holy Eucharist. It is likely to be helpful to many who wish to know what is the teaching of Holy Scripture on this subject. Nearly all which the Bishop of Fond du Lac says in it seems to us good and valuable. We are, however, of opinion that the paragraph in which he asserts that 'the kind of transubstantiation which is repudiated in our Articles' was also 'repudiated by the Council of Trent' (p. 5) should have been either amplified or omitted. As it stands, it will be disquieting to some readers, and it does not show whether, or in what respects, the doctrine which the Bishop advocates differs from any form of transubstantiation. In a tract of this kind, it might be well that this question should not be raised. If it is raised, it can hardly be put aside so lightly as in the paragraph which we have mentioned.

Greek Manuals of Church Doctrine. By the Rev. H. T. F. DUCKWORTH, M.A., formerly Postmaster of Merton College, Oxford; Representative in Cyprus of the Eastern Church Association. Published for the Eastern Church Association. (London: Rivingtons, 1901.)

THIS little book is a companion volume to Mr. Headlam's *The Teaching of the Russian Church*, which was published by Messrs. Rivingtons for the Eastern Church Association in 1897. In it Mr. Duckworth has shown very clearly and simply the main features and teaching of four catechisms which are in use in the Greek Church—namely, those of Bernardakis, Moschakis, Kyriakos, and Nektarios. We are acquainted with the four manuals on which his book is thus based, and have compared particular passages to which he refers with his translations or summaries of them, and have no hesitation in recommending his book to those who wish for an accurate account in a short form of the instruction ordered to be given in the Greek Church. He has probably acted wisely in making his translations somewhat freely, though the amplification of the sentence ἐπιγινώσκω τὴν ἐαυτοῦ φύσιν ὅσα τις ὑπάρχει, quoted by Nektarios (p. 229) from the *Apostolic Constitutions*,¹ into 'Let him be fully taught in the knowledge of his own nature, its laws, its capabilities, its tendencies' (p. 8), is perhaps excessive.

It is of very high importance that English churchpeople should possess much fuller and more accurate knowledge of the doctrine and practice of the Greek Church than is at all usual; and this little volume is well fitted to afford valuable help in acquiring it.

¹ Mr. Duckworth gives the reference to the *Apostolic Constitutions* as viii. 5. It should be vii. 39. The mistake appears to be due to Bishop Nektarios not giving any reference for this passage, and almost immediately after quoting viii. 5 with the reference.

The Passion. Historical Essay. By R. P. M. I. OLLIVIER, O.P.
Translated from the French by E. LEAHY. (Boston: Marlier
and Company, Limited, 1901.)

IT is with mingled feelings that we approach a book which professes to contain, as does the work before us, only an historical account of the Passion of our Lord, and which yet extends to over four hundred octavo pages. On the one hand, the awful solemnity of the ineffable suffering seems best safeguarded in the marked simplicity of the narrative given us by the Synoptic Evangelists and the beloved Apostle, and we almost shrink from the fuller details which such writers as Father Ollivier have gathered with long and scrupulous pains, and record with minute yet not irreverent particularity. On the other hand, there are doubtless those among the afflicted in body and mind—and it is to these the author dedicates his work—‘who will be strengthened in the hour of humiliation, of desolation, and of suffering’ by comparing the Divinity of our Lord with the abasement to which He condescends. In the composition of his work Father Ollivier has consulted a wide range of authorities, including the Talmuds of Jerusalem and Babylon, and the books of eminent Roman Catholic and Protestant authors, and he professes to discriminate between the reliance to be placed upon what he deems to be incontestable evidence and the revelations claimed by such mystics as St. Bridget, Marie d’Agréda, and Catherine Emmerich. Whether many of his authorities could stand the searching tests of modern historical criticism may well be questioned, and it is probably due to the pious facility with which many Roman authors accept legendary traditions that their works have been disregarded—as Father Ollivier complains they have—by so many eminent writers on the same topic.

Father Ollivier divides his essay into six books, which take their titles from the scene in which the events they describe were enacted—viz. Jerusalem, Gethsemane, Mount Sion, In the Antonia, From the Antonia to Calvary, and at the Tomb. In highly realistic and vivid description the several stages of the long-drawn Passion are brought into the strongest relief, and the reader cannot fail to be impressed by the profound earnestness with which the author has studied ‘the Passion,’ and his eager desire to make his treatment of it profitable to the souls of his readers. He accepts the assertion of the Talmud that Jesus was formally excommunicated by the Sanhedrin :

‘Thursday morning,’ he writes, ‘13 Nisan (17th March) beheld the faithful grouped around the doors of the four hundred synagogues of Jerusalem, whither they had been summoned by the trumpets of the Levites. A Priest appeared on the threshold, and in a voice of thrilling sadness declared Jesus of Nazareth, the seducer and false prophet, separated from the people in life and in death’ (p. 52).

It is perhaps inevitable that in elaborating a history which has been already written under the guidance of inspiration a modern writer should yield occasionally to the fancies of a capricious imagination. Such, at any rate, appears to us the suggestion that our Lord chose

O.P.
Farlier

esses
unt of
ndred
of the
plicity
nd the
which
scrupu-
ularity.
cted in
work—
olation,
with the
a of his
morities,
e books
professes
what he
med by
atherine
and the
estedion,
Roman
ve been
so many

ake their
nacted—
From the
and vivid
e brought
mpressed
died 'the
profitable
e Talmud
:

eheld the
agogues of
pets of the
of thrilling
e prophet,

has been
ern writer
agination.
ord chose

Gethsemane as the scene of His agony because it contained the tombs of His earthly ancestors, and '*expected consolation and precept from their grave*, as well as from Heaven' (p. 70); or that 'St. John affects to ignore (!) the agony of Jesus: he does not even allude to it, as if he feared to lower the Divine Ideal which he was proposing to the admiration and worship of the faithful of his time' (p. 63). We offer these observations in no carping spirit. The like criticism might in our judgment be applied to some of the quotations Father Ollivier inserts in his pages, and which are sheltered under the honoured names of Bossuet and Bourdaloue.

The peril that besets such a path as that which Father Ollivier traverses and the imperative need for self-restraint in venturing to amplify the Bible record are strikingly illustrated in the chapter which treats of the Seven Words from the Cross. It requires a somewhat longer extract to convey an adequate conception of its extraordinary indulgence in unverifiable assumptions:

'The dying Saviour's looks fell upon this little group of faithful friends, no doubt seeking Her whom He expected at this rendezvous of the Last Hour. Mary was standing on His left, near the unrepentant thief, as if she were trying to save him from the justice about to strike him. A vain effort, alas! for the unhappy wretch would not avail himself of Her intercession. There arose from the Heart of the Divine Mother an ardent supplication to the Sacred Heart of Her Son for the whole human race of whom He had made Her Co-redemptrix (!). What she desired, above all, was the assurance of pardon for mankind. He understood this well, and He immediately addressed Her in those words, *full of the respect due to the office with which He invested Her*, "Woman, behold Thy son!" and with a glance He designated St. John. Then, addressing the Disciple, He said, in grave sweet tones, "Son, behold thy Mother!" *That is to say*, "O my Mother, Queen and Mistress of all that is Mine, behold mankind, whom I confide to you that you may be henceforth their Advocate. I constitute you their Mother, that you may forbid Me to reject them, for I could not do it without rejecting you yourself. Be happy: they are saved. And you, O man, behold your Model and your Refuge. I have pardoned you, for I commit you to Her to whom I can refuse nothing when she intercedes in your favour"' (pp. 373-4).

Comment would appear superfluous upon this extract from a work which we are assured in its opening pages¹ 'is historical only and confined to a recital of the details as they are attested by the Gospel itself, Catholic tradition, or contemporary history.' To the reader who has not been trained in the modern cult of the Virgin Mother it is utterly incomprehensible that a writer who has entered with so much minuteness and feeling into the unapproachable agony with which our redemption was purchased should thus unwarrantably and instantly withdraw a share of its incommunicable privileges from that sacred heart which bore it. By the reader who has understood not merely the letter but the whole pervading spirit of the Gospel such teaching is seen to be irreconcilable with the testimony—of special weight, we should suppose, with Father Ollivier

¹ See Introduction, p. 3.

—of the Apostle St. Peter, that there is only one Name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved (Acts iv. 12). Nor can we forget that it was the very disciple to whom, according to the author, our dying Lord commended His Mother as *the Advocate of mankind* who in after years wrote, 'If any man sin we have an Advocate'—not the Blessed Virgin—but 'Jesus Christ the righteous' (1 John ii. 2). It is needless to remark that such a licence for reading into the simplest sentences whatever commends itself to the author's fancy, or may serve to bolster up the latest decisions of the Vatican, is absolutely fatal to all claim to be regarded as history, and brings down his book to the level of a pious romance.

An English Commentary on Dante's 'Divina Commedia.' By the Rev. H. F. TOZER. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1901.)

THIS book, so far as we are aware, is a new departure in Dante literature. It is the first time, we believe, that a commentary upon the *Commedia* has been published apart from the text, at any rate since the days of the mediæval commentators. The arrangement has its inconveniences. In the case of the early commentaries these were sometimes serious. It not infrequently happened, for example, that a commentary was issued after the author's death in company with a text of the *Commedia* which was in direct contradiction with the remarks of the commentator. A well-known instance is the edition of Landino's commentary accompanied by the Aldine text of the poem, a hybrid production which aroused the wrath of Vellutello. Vellutello himself suffered at a later period in a similar way, his own commentary being several times reprinted along with a text which he had previously condemned as full of inaccuracies. The result of such proceedings has been, as Dr. Moore pointed out in his *Textual Criticism of the Divina Commedia*, that there are numerous instances in modern editions of the *Commedia* where, on the strength of the accompanying text, the old commentators are cited as authorities for readings which the evidence of their own commentaries shows them to have rejected.

Mr. Tozer's English Commentary is avowedly intended for use with the Oxford text of the *Commedia* (published last year), to which it forms a companion volume. But it may be used equally well with any other edition, Mr. Tozer, as is explained in the preface, having taken special care to note the more important variations in the text, and to furnish the interpretations of the alternative readings. By this means the most serious inconvenience attaching to a separate commentary written to suit one particular text is to a great extent obviated. Whatever the inconveniences of this plan, however, there can be no doubt about the conveniences of it, and we congratulate the delegates of the Clarendon Press upon their enterprise in adopting it. By a wise provision the book is so arranged that, if desired, each of the three parts of the Commentary can be bound separately. In all material respects indeed the volume is wholly admirable. We have but one criticism to make. We could wish away the representation of Dante on the title-page, which

is a reduced facsimile of the very interesting woodcut on the title-page of the second (1521) edition of the *Amoroso Convivio*. The original, which has no pretensions to be an authentic portrait of the poet, is an admirable specimen of vigorous wood-engraving; but in the reproduction, which appears to have been prepared from a worn impression, and which is only half the size of the original, all the merits of the latter have disappeared. As no indication is given that we can discover as to the provenance of the portrait, the uninformed are likely to accept it as an unsuccessful modern attempt at the practically lost art of wood-engraving. In any case we cannot but regard it as a blemish on the title-page of an otherwise irreproachable book.

The first question which suggests itself with regard to Mr. Tozer's volume is whether there was any need for another English commentary on the *Divina Commedia*. The English Dante student was already pretty well provided in that respect—we have only to mention the commentaries of Cary, Longfellow, Dean Plumptre, and Mr. Butler, and the admirable *Readings* of Mr. Vernon. All of these, however, are accompanied by, or rather are ancillary to, a translation. Now a translator does not as a rule consider it his business to furnish paraphrases or detailed explanations of difficult passages, besides giving a rendering of them; and the consequence is that many of the acknowledged difficulties in Dante's poem are left unexplained, or only half explained, in the books above mentioned. With Mr. Tozer, on the other hand, to quote his preface once more, the primary aim has been to make Dante's meaning clear to the reader of the poem, and with a view to this, in interpreting the harder passages, translations, paraphrases, or explanations have been introduced, according as one or other of these methods appeared better suited for that purpose. This variety of method, which we may say at once is admirably followed out by Mr. Tozer, and which is eminently desirable in the case of so difficult an author as Dante, constitutes in our opinion a sufficient justification for the publication of this book. Mr. Tozer's notes have the great merit of being clear; and if they are not always exactly concise, they are at any rate to the point. As might be expected from his previous publications, his geographical notes are especially full and illuminating—a good example is the note on *Purgatorio* xxxiii. 112-113, where Dante speaks of Tigris and Euphrates having a common source. Mr. Tozer, who, if we mistake not, has published a paper on Dante as a geographer, very properly insists on the importance of Dante's geographical indications. Some of these, no doubt, as Mr. Tozer points out, were derived from the geographical sections of the work of Orosius, of which Dante has made such full use for other purposes, but a large number were certainly the outcome of his own personal observations. Another point to which Mr. Tozer pays special attention is the consideration of metrical questions. Those who have made use of Dr. Moore's volume on *Textual Criticism*, already referred to, will be acquainted with Mr. Tozer's elaborate appendix on the principles of metre and scansion

observed by Dante in the *Divina Commedia*, some of the conclusions of which are naturally utilized in the present volume. He oddly enough makes no remark on the scansion of *Livio* as a trisyllable in *Inferno* xxviii. 12, which is no doubt due, as Mr. Butler observes, to the *scr* of the following word (*scrive*).

We do not understand on what principle quotations from Aristotle are given in Greek. Mr. Tozer is fully aware (as appears from a sentence in his preface) that Dante was ignorant of Greek and had access to Aristotle, and such other Greek authors as he quotes, only at second hand, or in Latin translations. It is wholly misleading to quote the Greek text of Aristotle, as we possess it, as if it represented the text known to Dante. That he had to rely upon translations, and that in some cases the translations were inexact, and did not agree with each other, we know from an interesting passage in the second book of the *Convivio* (cap. 15), where, in a discussion as to the origin of the Milky Way, he says he cannot make out what Aristotle's opinion on the subject really was, owing to the contradictions between the two translations of the *De Meteoris* (i.e. probably between the version made from the Arabic by Michael Scot, and that made direct from the Greek by, or at the instigation of, Thomas Aquinas). Nor can we approve of Mr. Tozer's practice of quoting from the Italian translation of the *Trésor* of Brunetto Latini, instead of from the original, which is perfectly accessible in the edition of M. Chabaille. It is well known that the Italian version teems with interpolations; consequently there is always the risk that a quotation from that source may not be from Brunetto's own work at all. On the other hand, we are glad to note that Mr. Tozer consistently refers to the Vulgate, bearing in mind that our Authorized Version does not always correspond to the Latin version of the Scriptures utilized by Dante. Failure to recognize this has been responsible for one or two curious mistakes in recent English commentaries on the *Commedia*.

Perhaps the most valuable, and in some respects the most original, portions of Mr. Tozer's commentary are the excellent summaries and analyses which he gives of the philosophical and theological disquisitions with which the poem abounds, especially in the *Paradiso*. These will be found of great assistance not only by those who are reading the poem for the first time, but also by the more practised reader. Controversial notes are happily conspicuous by their absence. In the case of disputed interpretations, Mr. Tozer has adopted the wise course of avoiding lengthy discussions and citations from authorities, and has contented himself with giving that which is most generally accepted, or has the most to be said for it. For example, the question as to the identity of the *Veliro* of *Inferno* i. 101, which by itself has given birth to a considerable body of literature, is disposed of, quite satisfactorily as far as essentials are concerned, within the compass of little more than half a page.

Mr. Tozer appears to have availed himself to the full of the most recent English authorities on Dante and his sources, notably of

Mr. Toynbee's *Dante Dictionary*, and Dr. Moore's volumes of *Studies*. These works, together with Professor Fay's invaluable *Concordance*, have immensely lightened the task of the Dante commentator of the present day. It is somewhat significant, not only perhaps of Mr. Tozer's own limitations in the field of Dantesque literature, but also of the hold which the study of Dante has taken in England, that, of seventeen works upon Dante cited as authorities in the preface to this volume, no less than nine are English. Of the remainder, four are German, two only are Italian (certainly a grievous disproportion, at any rate so far as numbers are concerned), and two American.

We would suggest that in a future edition of the English Commentary some maps, plans, and diagrams might profitably be added. A few simple diagrams, for instance, would greatly assist in the comprehension of certain of the complicated astronomical problems with which the student of the *Divina Commedia* is called upon to grapple. Before taking leave of the volume we may draw attention to a slip (the only one we have succeeded in discovering); it occurs on page 15, where (in the note on *Inferno* iii. 12) 'Aeneas' should be read for 'Virgil.'

A Commentary on Tennyson's 'In Memoriam.' By A. C. BRADLEY, LL.D., Professor of Poetry in the University of Oxford. (London: Macmillan & Co., 1901.)

THE new Professor of Poetry at Oxford, though doubtless well known and highly esteemed by his own friends and by his pupils in the northern University of his adoption, is less well known in his own University, to which he has now returned, and is scarcely known at all by the reading public in general. To many the volume now before us will be their first introduction to him as a literary critic; and although it was composed before his election to the chair of Keble, of Matthew Arnold, and of Shairp, it will be regarded as his credentials upon taking up this honourable post. From this point of view we cannot but consider it as an unfortunate production. There may be those who like to have their poetry eviscerated and deprived at once of its life and beauty, and laid before them as an anatomical specimen, but we cannot regard such a work as worthy occupation for a literary critic of the first rank, nor can we suppose that any single reader of *In Memoriam* will be the better for it. We do not for a moment dispute Professor Bradley's assertion that the meaning of many passages in the poem is doubtful, and that a few are extremely obscure, although the intelligences to which some of his remarks must be supposed to be directed must be of very limited range; but we cannot believe that anyone will profit by working through it, commentary in hand, as though it were a philosophical text-book. The reader who makes his own way through the difficulties, or even he who simply shirks them, will derive lifelong help and inspiration from many of the poet's words; but the reader who reduces the poetry to the dead level of prose will find nothing that he could not have obtained more coherently from religious or

philosophical treatises. The poet's function is not to produce a system of philosophy, but to render 'current coin' the higher thoughts of mankind; to drive home, and to make part of the common heritage of his countrymen, thoughts which, dimly and dumbly, were latent in their intelligence already, or which their intelligence welcomes readily when once presented to it. An essay on a poem may promote an intelligent comprehension of it; a detailed commentary is more likely to kill it altogether. Mr. Bradley offers both; but in his introductory chapters we find little that is likely to be of value to the ordinary reader, while the commentary, though we have dipped into it in places, we must respectfully beg to be excused from reading in full.

We do not wish to be unjust to Mr. Bradley, and are quite ready to admit that those who wish for a commentary on *In Memoriam* will find one here which is likely to meet all their needs. It is our respect for the poem which makes us wish that, for some generations at least, it might be free from the commentator; and we hope that before long Mr. Bradley will give us something which will justify, in a more satisfactory fashion, the high opinion held of him by those who have been privileged to know him and to learn from him.

Robert Browning as a Religious Teacher. Being the Burney Essay for 1900. By ARTHUR CECIL PIGOU, B.A., Scholar of King's College [Cambridge]. (London: C. J. Clay & Sons, 1901.)

THIS little volume falls, to some extent, under the same condemnation as that which has just been noticed, as an attempt to reduce a poet's thoughts to the level of philosophical prose; but Mr. Pigou has many excuses which are not open to Professor Bradley. In the first place, the subject of his prize essay was presumably not of his own choosing; in the second, he has not pulverised any single poem, but merely selected and arranged thoughts from a great number of them, so that one's enjoyment of the originals is not impaired; and thirdly, there is so much definitely religious and ethical teaching scattered through the works of Browning that it is not unreasonable to try to bring it together and to see whether it can be expressed as a coherent system. The mistake of this essay lies rather in the prominence given to metaphysics. If any metaphysical system were fully satisfactory, and answered all the riddles of the universe, it might be reasonable to ask how far the teaching of a didactic or philosophical poet is in accordance with it; but it is not reasonable to blame a poet because it is impossible to extract a full and coherent metaphysical theory from the religious teaching contained in his poems. The prophet is greater than the philosopher; and the rank of the poet is with the former rather than with the latter.

Mr. Pigou seems to us to exaggerate the difficulties in Browning's philosophy, as, for example, in reference to his treatment of the problem of evil. It is one thing, recognising the limitations of our human reason, to say that evil may be seen by a higher intelligence to be good; it is another to say that evil (and good also) is unreal,

because it exists in Time, and Time is but a mode of the human mind ; and the former rather than the latter appears to us to be Browning's habitual attitude. But space does not admit of an adequate discussion of the question here ; nor do we attach much weight to it. Browning, like Tennyson, but with a wider range and more powerful intellect, gives expression to the highest thoughts and intuitions of humanity on subjects with regard to which the human mind, in its present state, can never have perfect knowledge ; and it is no deduction from their helpfulness and their elevating influence to say that, in the last analysis, they involve metaphysical antinomies. The fault is in the metaphysics, not in the poet. Consequently Mr. Pigou's essay might have been more useful, as well as more interesting, if he had devoted less attention to first principles, and more to those *media axiomata* which touch actual life more nearly, and in which Browning's poetry is so rich. No poet, except Shakespeare, has illustrated human life more plentifully or from so many points of view ; no poet has given utterance to more helpful and elevating thoughts 'on man, on nature, and on human life.' On these matters of ethics Mr. Pigou's treatment is somewhat scanty and inadequate. With regard to the more definitely religious side of Browning's teaching Mr. Pigou has little difficulty in showing that he was a believer in the essential doctrines of the Christian revelation ; and this needs emphatic statement, since Mrs. Sutherland Orr, whose biography of the poet, inadequate as it is in more than one respect, holds the field at present as the only one written with inside knowledge, has gone out of her way to minimise the extent of his dogmatic beliefs. There is good reason to believe that her statement of his attitude on religious matters is not accepted by others who have as good, or better, right to speak in his name ; and to us it appears absurd to try to explain away the express language of such poems as *Christmas Eve* and *Ferishtah's Fancies*, or even of more dramatic pieces, such as *A Death in the Desert*, *Saul*, *The Pope* (in *The Ring and the Book*) or the *Epistle of Karshish*. Mr. Pigou does not quote the most emphatic passages in *Christmas Eve*, such as the lines beginning 'Truth's atmosphere may grow mephitic.' Possibly it was too long for quotation in full ; but a reference to its argument would have strengthened his position.

For the rest, Mr. Pigou has evidently worked very carefully through Browning's poetry, and has classified his extracts under their appropriate heads. From the literary point of view his method has its drawbacks, since his essay has the effect of a mosaic of quotations rather than of an independent literary whole ; but this is the fault of those who appointed the subject for the essay, and it is perhaps characteristic of Cambridge methods and ideals to consider substance, even in a prize essay, rather than literary form. As a work of reference, however, it would have been better if Mr. Pigou had made his work more exact, by giving the numbers of the lines or sections, at least in the case of the longer poems.

It is fair to state, in conclusion, that Mr. Pigou fully realizes the limitations of his own work. He has systematized, very ably and

adequately, the express religious and philosophical dogmas which he finds in Browning's poems; but he does not make the mistake of thinking that he has thereby extracted the essence of his poetry. On the contrary, it is the essence which escapes such a process. It is not in the formal argumentation of such a poem as *La Saisiaz*, still less in the somewhat sophistical dialectics of *Fifine* (of which Mr. Pigou perhaps makes too much use), that the most essential utterances of Browning's inspiration are found. These we may forget; but we do not forget the 'Love is best' of *Love among the Ruins*, the 'God's in His heaven, All's right with the world,' of *Pippa*, the 'This throws himself on God, and unperplexed Seeking shall find Him,' of *A Grammarian's Funeral*, the last nine lines of *Karshish*, the lines beginning 'There burns a truer light of God in them' in *Andrea del Sarto*, the last four stanzas of *Abt Vogler*, or those beginning 'Not on the vulgar mass Called "work" must sentence pass,' in *Rabbi Ben Ezra*, the whole of *Prospice*, the lyric 'So the head aches,' and the epilogue in *Ferishtah's Fancies*, or the final epilogue to his whole life's work, in which he summed up his courageous, cheerful, yet God-fearing and God-loving creed, characterizing himself as

'One who never turned his back but marched breast forward,
Never doubted clouds would break,
Never dreamed, though right were worsted, wrong would triumph,
Held we fall to rise, are baffled to fight better,
Sleep to wake.'

The Church, the Churches, and the Mysteries; or, Revelation and Corruption. By G. H. PEMBER, M.A. (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1901.)

It will not be necessary to detain the reader for a very long time by our remarks on Mr. Pember's book, although it is part of a large scheme of three volumes, and deals with a perplexing variety of subjects. We only feel constrained to notice it at all because it is marked by a certain literary peculiarity, not to say eccentricity, and because it takes a hopeless view of the Church of England which we should be sorry not to oppose. This volume is described by Mr. Pember as complete in itself, although it forms the second of a series of three upon the great prophecies of the centuries upon Israel and the Gentiles and the Church. Here he endeavours to set forth the Scriptural idea of the Church as he understands it, the practical bearings of the meaning and use of the term, the conditions and behaviour and gifts of the members of the Church, its laws, ordinances, and government. When this Scriptural revelation has been considered Mr. Pember unveils the source of the influence which has so marvellously corrupted it. This corruption has made disastrous way in the Church of England, if we accept Mr. Pember's view. Her course 'has ever been fitful and unsteady'; she has 'deliberately reversed her steps, and set her face determinedly towards the veiled Paganism of priests and sacraments'; she is 'not merely commencing, but has almost accomplished, a retrograde

movement from Bible light to mediæval darkness.' Among the causes of this sad state Mr. Pember mentions 'the enmity of the carnal mind against God, which prompts men to instinctive disobedience'; the power of Satan; the fact that a national Church, with honours and emoluments to bestow, must inevitably number among her clergy many who, though upright and sincere according to the world's standard, are not actuated solely by the love of Him who died for sinners, and therefore cannot enjoy the guidance of His Spirit; and especially the fact that each succeeding generation of men is found to depend too much, if not altogether, upon ancient custom, vague tradition, the laws of some Church, or its own idea of what is right, and so does not continually refer for motives of belief and action to the written and unchanging Word of God. Mr. Pember gives a list of twenty-nine institutions, doctrines, and practices of 'Catholicism as opposed to primitive or Evangelical Christianity,' and discusses them at great length by way of proving that 'Catholicism is simply Paganism with a Christian nomenclature, and is not Christianity at all.' The word 'Catholic,' Mr. Pember tells us, was adopted in a technical sense, as indicating the orthodox, by those ecclesiastical Christians who, taking their model from the Pagan mysteries, believed in salvation by priests and sacraments. He resigns the word to those to whom it of right belongs as a designation of hierarchical as opposed to evangelical and apostolical Christians. He censures a note in the *Churchman's Pocket Book* for 1897, published by what he calls the 'Society for the Propagation of Christian Knowledge,' in which the Lord's Mother is 'boldly called Theotokos,' and, in defiance of all orthodox explanations against Nestorianism, he actually says that this term means 'the Mother of Christ's Divine Nature,' and that this title 'implies that she is herself a goddess.' He is also so anxious to connect Catholic with Pagan rites that he tells us that the word *missa*, or round wafer, used in the worship of Mithras is 'the origin of the Roman Catholic term *missa*, the Mass.' Our readers will have gained an impression from our remarks of Mr. Pember's mode of treatment, and the quotations which we have given sufficiently illustrate his scholarship and theology, without further serious discussion of the chapters in which he writes upon the Church and Sacraments, the gifts of ministry, the courts of heaven, sacerdotal ceremonies, sex in deity, incense, the tonsure, the brethren of the Lord, mystery plays, varieties of patristic and mediæval corruption, the number of the beast, the position of St. Peter, Buddha, St. Basil, and Dr. Mivart. We will only use the opening words of Mr. Pember's last chapter and say, 'Our unpleasing task is now accomplished.'

The Victories of Rome and the Temporal Monarchy of the Church.

By the Rev. K. D. BEST. Fourth Edition, Revised. (London: Kegan Paul, 1901.)

SINCE the first appearance of the *Victories of Rome*, thirty-four years ago, its author has continued to strive to uphold the cause of the temporal power of the Pope. During that period some important

changes have taken place, but the present edition is substantially the same as that which last appeared, in 1893. By adopting 'the Temporal Monarchy of the Church' as a part of his title the author reminds his readers of the learned work of Francesco Bozio, in five books, *De Temporalis Ecclesie Monarchia et Jurisdictione*, in which the origin of the Roman Pontiff's royalty is traced. The present little work, which its author calls a pamphlet, is made up of sketches and scraps which give glimpses of the historical vicissitudes of the Papacy. Arnold of Brescia's relation to the Emperor Conrad, and the assistance which Ockham rendered to Louis of Bavaria, are regarded as anticipations of the co-operation of the royal house of Savoy with Mazzini and Garibaldi, when, 'against every principle of religion, gratitude, honour, and honesty,' they 'completed their crime by the great sacrilege of September 20, 1870.' The temporal sovereignty is regarded as 'an integral right of the Church as constituted by her divine Founder,' a statement which sounds strangely when read in connexion, we do not say with passages in the Gospels, but with the 'acts' of the first conciliar age, when Rome held, in conjunction with one or two other great sees, an acknowledged place of signal dignity and honour. Without dealing with historical evidence it is no good to say that this sovereignty has prevailed *de facto* for more than 1,200 years, and has been possessed *de jure* by divine natural law from the beginning of Christianity. And when these statements are brought to the bar of history there is abundant evidence at hand in the history of our own country alone to show that papal interference was strenuously resisted in the English Church before the Reformation over and over again; while in the fourth and fifth centuries, if the temporal sovereignty of the Bishop of Rome was not resisted, the reason was that it was not asserted. A list of works is given which have suggested or confirmed much in these pages. The first chapter is devoted to historical sketches and epochs, and the second sets forth the 'necessity' of the temporal power. To read these chapters is sufficient to understand why Roman Catholics persist in what seems to the majority of Englishmen to be running their heads against a brick wall in this matter of the temporal power, and also provides some explanation of the very deep dread of Rome on the part of many English Church people who are commonly regarded as indistinguishable from Roman Catholics in doctrinal matters. The fact is, apart from the complete absence of Vaticanism from the ancient Catholic world, the free insular Englishman utterly rejects the Pope in his political aspect, and neither the fervid eloquence of Father Faber's sermon nor the author's own sermon, admirable in its way, nor the Syllabus of Pope Pius IX. concerning the temporal power—all of which are inserted in appendices—can move the mind of the mass of the English people on this subject, and it is true kindness to say so plainly, and, we may add, true wisdom to recognize it. Even Mr. Hall Caine's latest novel teaches us that the Pope must renounce the temporal power in the Eternal City to reign supreme over a Christianized humanity. The tears of the Popes are more powerful

than their arms; and it is better that the chief Bishop of Christendom should cherish his supernatural power to say, Arise and walk, than that he should be in a position of worldly pomp, and bestow silver and gold upon his subjects. Mr. Gladstone's Vatican controversies gave expression to the opinion of many of the most Catholic-minded of his fellow-countrymen, and the present little book, if it comforts and encourages a few Roman Catholics, will not alter the conviction of a single member of the Church of England, unless we are very much mistaken. That is to say, we regard it as apologetically worthless.

Huldreich Zwingli, the Reformer of German-Switzerland, 1484-1531.

By Professor S. M. JACKSON. (New York and London: Putnam's Sons, 1901.)

PROFESSOR JACKSON of New York is the originator of the series of fully illustrated works on the *Heroes of the Reformation* to which this biography of Zwingli belongs. The reader would be hard to please who refused to praise the excellence of the illustrations, the clearness of the type, the smoothness of the paper, and the generous expenditure of industry which is evident in all parts of the Professor's work. One fault, which is not uncommon in American books, is that the book is far too heavy for its size, so that it is tiresome to hold it.

By this biography Zwingli is apparently placed in a company which, as at present arranged, includes Luther, Melancthon, Erasmus, Beza, Calvin, Knox, and Cranmer. Professor Jackson has studiously endeavoured to carry out the plan of the series and to make his book not a mere eulogy but a critical biography, in which he does not ignore defects of judgment nor refrain from blame when he considers that it is required; and, on the other hand, he is in full sympathy with the nobler parts of the character of his subject, and does ample justice to his distinctive contribution to the Reformation movement. With a very great respect for Zwingli his present biographer does not claim a place for him in the front rank of the great men of the world, or consider that he was equal to Luther or Calvin. His literary work was frequently marred by haste, and few unbiassed judges would hesitate in deciding the question of republication. In his treatment of the Baptists Professor Jackson describes him as having been prejudiced and cruel; he exhibits a weak jealousy towards Luther, and at all events in his later life a political element was unduly prominent in his conduct. But as the leader of the Reformation movement in German Switzerland he spent his days in the service of the truth, as he understood it. His character is marked by generosity, self-sacrifice, a power of winning affection, and a sturdiness which could not be bribed. He saw clearly the cause of his country's decline, and in spite of her faults patriotically laid down his life for her sake. He wins Professor Jackson's admiration 'as a man, as an indefatigable worker, as a broad-minded scholar, as an approved player of a large part on a small stage.' It is perhaps true that he is nearer to our modern ways of thought

than Luther, or Melancthon, or Calvin. Professor Jackson has been fortunate in securing two contributions to his book, which greatly help the reader to form a true estimate of Zwingli's love for his country and of his theology, in Professor Vincent's historical survey of Switzerland before the Reformation and Professor Foster's chapter on Zwingli's theology. The sources of information which Professor Jackson has used have enabled him to produce an accurate and reliable biography. Among them are the letters by and to Zwingli, Bullinger's contemporary history of the Reformation in Switzerland, the Acts of the Councils of Zürich and other cities, the existing biographies of Christoffel, Moerikofer, and Staehelin, and various monographs, as well as *Zwingliana*, the semi-yearly organ of Zwingli studies carried on by Professor Egli. These and other indispensable aids to the study of Zwingli are conveniently arranged in an introductory list of works. The sixteen chapters of the book put the general reader in possession of the principal facts of Zwingli's life from his birth in 1484 to his death in 1531. He was born at Wildenhaus, about forty miles from Zürich, and in 1487 his father moved twelve miles off to Wesen, where his boyhood was spent. He was sent to school at Basel in 1494, and being a brilliant pupil proceeded first to Bern, and then went to take his degree in the University of Vienna. After a pastoral charge at Glarus and a temporary residence at Einsiedeln he accepted the influential but poorly paid place of people's priest at the great minster of Zürich in 1519. Here was the scene of his Reformation work. He at once began a course of Scriptural exposition in the cathedral, and his opening year at Zürich was marked by the failure of an indulgence-seller to prosecute his work successfully there. Professor Jackson places the real beginning of the Reformation in Zürich in the year 1522. As a result of his teaching some members of his congregation declared in Lent of that year that they would not fast if it was not required by Scripture. The question of the recognition of the wives of the clergy also had an important bearing on the growing movement. The next year, 1523, is notable on account of the two great disputations which were held at Zürich, in which Zwingli set forth his view of Reformation principles. The Scriptural authority of many existing practices was denied; but although Zwingli proceeded with more caution and prudence than some other reformers the cessation of such practices, when once regarded as unscriptural, was but a matter of time, and the year 1524 marked the completion of the break with Rome as far as Zürich was concerned. Zwingli's marriage was publicly announced in that year too, and for the next four or five years he was largely occupied with the internal dissensions of the Reformed congregations, which were chiefly marked by bitter disputes with the Baptists. His closing years, when he was an accepted leader of the Swiss Protestants, were filled with political activity, and it was not an unsuitable end to such a life that he died in battle at Cappel on October 11, 1531, when he bore the banner, according to Swiss custom, as chief pastor in the defence of Zürich against the Forest Cantons' troops. The general reader of the

interesting narrative which we have but slightly summarized will not feel inclined to read much of the matter which is conveniently placed apart either in additional notes at the end of the chapters or in the appendix. But the student of history and of theology will find here much that deserves his careful attention on Zwingli's family, on his correspondence, his Papal pension, his self-made transcript of St. Paul's Epistles, his sermons against the pensioners and pensions, his epistolary references to Luther. Professor Foster's essay on his theology, philosophy, and ethics will naturally be read in close connexion with the sermon on the selection of foods, the Confession of Faith, and the sixty-seven articles issued by Zwingli in German, and giving a succinct account of his teaching, which are included, the first two in full and the third well summarized, in Professor Jackson's book. It is impossible here to enlarge upon the peculiarities of Zwingli's theology. We must content ourselves with a reference to one or two salient points introduced by the caution that the Church of England, being heartily Protestant with regard to the Papacy in its modern Vatican sense, does not at all accept that term as a description of her position with regard to the Bible or the ministry or the Sacraments, in any way which would imply that she is in doctrinal accord on those points with the Protestantism of the Continent or of the various denominations which have dissented from her teaching at home. Remembering the history of the meaning of the words 'such studies as help to the knowledge of the same,' which the Church of England has placed in her ordinal, and also remembering the incessant appeal which she makes to primitive authority and the principle of the Vincentian Canon, we feel compelled to reject as a false antithesis the assertion that the Bible is to be interpreted by itself alone, and not by the Fathers, on which Zwingli laid much stress. It is interesting to observe that in a special sermon, as well as in his 'reckoning of the faith,' he believed in the 'perpetual virginity of Mary the Mother of Jesus Christ our Saviour.' His whole Sacramental position, by which he is, perhaps, best known to general readers, rises out of a curious view about faith, according to which he held, in Professor Foster's account, that, as its object is always Christ or God as revealed in Him, it cannot have any material thing, like the Body of Christ, for its proper object (p. 391). He makes no distinction between the baptism of our Lord and of His forerunner. His belief as to the other great Sacrament of the Gospel seems to us practically to justify the ordinary use of the term Zwinglianism, though some objection has recently been taken to that use. In his own words he believes that 'the true Body of Christ is present by the contemplation of faith,' because 'everything done by Christ becomes present' by such contemplation. But he denies that 'the Body of Christ in essence and reality, that is the natural Body itself,' is 'present in the Supper.' He receives the words, 'This is My Body,' 'not naturally but figuratively,' and says that 'those things are called the Body and Blood of Christ which are the symbols of the true Body.' From a boy Zwingli was a lover of disputation, and as we close the book we are reminded of

the lesson which Newman saw so clearly written across the pages of Arianism, that controversy is the very life and weapon of heresy. To Churchmen, who know that the weapons of our warfare are not carnal, there is, too, a curious significance in the illustration which is inserted in the midst of the essay on Zwingli's theology. It represents the helmet, sword, and so-called battle-axe which he carried to the battle-field on the day of his death.

The Saints and Missionaries of the Anglo-Saxon Era. Second Series. By the Rev. D. C. O. ADAMS, M.A. (Oxford and London: Mowbray, 1901.)

MR. ADAMS'S difficulties in making a second book of lives of Anglo-Saxon missionaries and saints have arisen more from the rich abundance than the scarcity of the materials at hand for this purpose. As in his earlier volume he has arranged his biographies in chronological order, grouping them in periods of time. He calls the first the missionary period, because it was marked by Anglo-Saxon labours on the Continent. Its brightest ornament is the great name of St. Boniface, rightly called the Apostle of Germany, but dear to Englishmen in his homelier title of Winfrid of Crediton. An excellent biography is given of him, with a good portrait; and with this must be mentioned the well-known picture of St. Boniface's departure, inserted as a frontispiece, and familiar to the readers of Mrs. Jameson's *Legends of the Monastic Orders*. Various appropriate notes are appended to the 'Life.' The period, as the readers of Pertz and other recorders know full well, was one of unsurpassed missionary enthusiasm, and Mr. Adams has but made a selection from a noble list when he has told us of Egbert and his companions, Willibrord, Swidbert and Adelbert, the two Hewalds, Wigbert, Burkhard, Richard, the father of a family of saints, Lioba and Lullus, relatives of St. Boniface, Willehad, Sola, and Lebwin. Mr. Adams also gives lives of St. Guthlac, the hermit of Crowland, his sister St. Pega, and St. Egwin, Bishop of Worcester, with some interesting illustrations, as contemporaries in this period. We should be glad to think that the popular and yet careful style of Mr. Adams's narrative had encouraged some at least of his readers to penetrate further into the history of the conversion of the northern races. Even a slight acquaintance with the story will soon convince a student of it that he is reading one of the most glorious chapters of the history of the kingdom which is not of this world; and it is a chapter, too, in which our own countrymen fill a place of signal splendour.

In this work, however, there followed a time when, as Bede had to deplore in the history of Anglo-Saxon monasticism, the fine gold became dim. Mr. Adams calls it the Dark Period. The ravages of the Danes account for much if not for all that has to be regretted in the cessation of missionary enterprise, the smaller list of saints, the destruction of precious treasures of learning and architecture, and the resulting period of ignorance. Three of the names which Mr. Adams selects in this division of his series are connected in different ways with Oxford, St. Frideswid, St. Kenelm, and St. Ebba.

St. Swithin, St. Neot, and St. Ives are at least by name familiar to a wider circle of readers. Another biography, accompanied by an illustration, is that of St. Edmund, in whom we may be interested without admitting the authenticity of his alleged relics on too slender evidence.¹ A few obscurer names are added to the list.

As Mr. Adams says, towards the close of the ninth century the revival of religion and letters which took place was inaugurated by Alfred, and no apology is needed for the introduction of a timely memoir of that king among the narratives of the saints. It gives in a handy form the outline and draws attention to the chief lessons of Alfred's life as a Churchman, a scholar, a soldier, and an Englishman. It was right, of course, to include the name of Edward, the martyred son of Edgar, in the list; but the other great name of this period is St. Dunstan, whose memoir Mr. Adams draws principally from Osborn's Life. The prefatory note should, in our judgment, have directed the reader to the masterly piece of work by which the late Dr. Stubbs placed Dunstan in his true place in English history.

The closing period of the Anglo-Saxon era, as marked out by Mr. Adams, is adorned with the names of St. Alphege and Edward the Confessor. It includes also a short biography of St. William, Bishop of Roschild, the old capital of Denmark, who refused to allow the king to enter the cathedral when his hands were red with blood, with a courage which recalls the great scene between St. Ambrose and Theodosius. At the conclusion of the biographies is a brief account of St. Margaret of Scotland. Apart from the biographical interest of the book, and the improving lessons which Mr. Adams draws from historical incidents, mention should be made of the varied material which is included in detached notes and paragraphs, such as those upon pilgrimages, Croyland Abbey, sanctuaries, Evesham Abbey, mediæval discipline, the king's evil, and Glastonbury. The illustrations, which greatly add to the interest of the book, include a representation of St. Frideswid, taken from an old book in the library of Magdalen College, Oxford. The critical historian will perhaps complain that Mr. Adams does not sift his materials to much purpose. To be sure he does not insert the story of the cakes in his life of Alfred, nor does he call him the founder of the University of Oxford, but he speaks of the important share which Croyland had 'in the foundation of the modern University of Cambridge,' and apparently derives this opinion from accepting the story of Joffrid's barn, related by Ingulf, as veracious history.

The Philosophy of Religion in England and America. By ALFRED CALDECOTT, D.D., Professor of Logic and Mental Philosophy in King's College, London, formerly Fellow and Dean of King's College, Cambridge. (London: Methuen, 1901.)

THE work of Professor Caldecott is extremely complete in its information and full of suggestions of thought. Its subject may to

¹ See the *Guardian*, August 7, 1901, p. 1075, where the salient passages of Dr. James's able letter to the *Times* are quoted; and the *Times*, September 5, 1901.

some students of religion appear inferior in practical importance to the question of the hour, which is doubtless that of the higher criticism of the documents of early Christianity. But it should be remembered that this higher criticism depends for its practical results on men's minds upon that philosophy of religion which dwells already in writers and readers. It cannot have the same effect upon a mind which doubts whether any real access to a supernatural sphere of thought and fact is attainable by man as on one in which this general question has secured an answer. Nor need any Christian shrink from admitting that his faith, and that of the whole Church and of all mankind, has from the first rested on the fact that religion is a part of the inheritance of the race, from which man, though he desire it, cannot be free.

It must be owned that a philosophy of religion was formerly taught in England without any living religious results. That dull era has been duly chronicled by our author. It was the dead time of Deism. It had no right to be called a time of Theism : for it conceived of God only as the Author in the far distance of a machine which needed Him no more : nor a time of Religion, for that is a word expressing everyday action : nor even a time of Philosophy, for that word has an honoured history full of effects upon life, both Christian and general. And if at some periods philosophy in England and elsewhere has been of small repute among Christians for its tendency to run to words, that should not prejudice its genuine meaning. Philosophy truly understood implies that he who thinks most fully of all that is at his command is himself most full of the seeds of good living.

Near the outset Professor Caldecott sets forth (pp. 10, 117.) some definitions of God which have been offered by modern philosophers as well as theologians. There the reader will find certain epithets implying inscrutable mystery, such as infinite, eternal, supreme and absolute, but mingled with them others which can no more be excluded from contact with the limited world than we can exclude the facts of the Gospel : such as 'all-powerful, by whom I was created.' 'Theism represents us as the work of a Being perfectly good, wise, and powerful,' 'the free and intelligent Author of all things,' 'the upholder of the world and the Father of our spirits,' ruling the universe, and holding moral relations with mankind.' When a man has well pondered the conditions of knowledge and the difficulties which belief in such a Being imposes on those who would make it real to themselves, he will perhaps find that objections to the gospel history correspond very closely to objections to religion in any of its forms.

The plan of the book is simple. The first part fills about a fourth of the whole, and consists of an introduction entitled 'The Types Described.' In this the lines of argument or reflection which have been pursued in England and America by various writers upon the great question are carefully described and classified. At this stage it may strike an ordinary Christian that few religious persons of his acquaintance have built their belief in God upon reasons so systematic as these. All indeed must agree that reason

for the faith that is in us should be rendered upon the being of God as well as for what follows from it. But even a very ordinary education to belief in God seems to find something congenial to it in our minds. Many doubt whether when once it has been engrafted it can ever be wholly eradicated, however its possessor may desire to be rid of it. Books upon the subject take each its own line, as useful books should do; but readers keep their minds open for other lines of argument, and none entirely express the whole reason or the whole unconscious attraction to belief which human nature holds diffused. Various races and minds recognise a consensus of Theism capable of various applications. This consensus yields in itself reasons for acceptance of its belief. Sometimes it renders a kind of undefined sanction to varying forms of the same great argument (pp. 10-18).

Passing from the great general fact that religion seems a part of our human inheritance, we come to the group of thoughts and theories in which religious belief is regarded as a species of knowledge, the possession of particular minds which exert themselves to gain it. The first type of this group the author names Intuitionism. Intuition means immediate perception, and it is believed by many that God is known by simply opening the mind to look at Him. However, there is large room for differences in filling up the description of God, and in the answers which men make to the question what it is that they see when they see God. The type is restricted by Professor Caldecott to those cases in which it is clearly asserted that the mind of man has a direct power of perceiving that something exists above us. This framework, if one may so call it, may be afterwards filled up in various ways. Thus intuitionism of this form may underlie polytheism, or the deity whom the mind has recognised may be left with little active relation to the world.

Another type is furnished by those who have argued out the knowledge of God from His works. This is so natural a kind of reason that S. Paul blames the heathen as without excuse for neglecting it. It admits of being expressed in various forms, of which nine are suggested by our author; of these the most persuasive since the nature of causation has been thought out, is probably that in which 'the world as a mass of causes and effects requires a cause which is never effect but only cause' (p. 21).

This type of argument is undoubtedly open to the objection that it involves a great leap—from finite to infinite. The Apostle would perhaps have replied to the objection by claiming for the God-given reason of man a constructive power compelling assent. Perhaps his words imply this claim. And for those who think thus about the faculty of reason, 'the argument,' says Professor Caldecott, 'is cogent, and the result a demonstration' (p. 22). Reason is effectually helped to this great leap by Teleology, which notes in nature the unfailing connexion between individual things or groups of things and ends to which they tend; whereby we are led forward to 'the sublime conclusion of one integrating principle everywhere.'

These two types have been the stay of many wise men's faith, and believers allow that they still possess their power. But the third is perhaps of more importance still; and we suppose our author to think so. He calls it Transcendental Idealism. Its development originated with Kant, though we may well believe that it has been unconsciously held by the faithful of all times. Kant is well known to have rendered by his critical method the intellectual statements of many previous thinkers, both of Theists and of Sceptics, untenable in certainty and strictness. But he found in the active powers of the human conscience and the implications which accompany them a spiritual compensation for much which he destroyed. He did not indeed represent us as attaining through ordinary intellectual power the faith in a God who transcends our experience. But we find Him in the high meaning which the underlying consciousness of His presence and power confers upon our experience. This presence and power of God is found chiefly in the work of our moral nature to encourage or reprove; and multitudes of men have been forced by experience to acknowledge Him in that quarter. At the same time, their inability to say how or why they felt so, sometimes against their wills and in spite of their mental persuasions, showed that their knowledge transcended all their intellectual powers.

Something, no doubt, is wanting in this proof of God, which Kant recognised and Hegel followed up. Yet what can excel in distinctness or strength the voice which conscience mysteriously utters and embodies in beliefs which we can no more refuse than we can understand them, namely, faith in a God above us and a freedom and responsibility belonging to our nature, and a life beyond this world in which the moral principles may have that free course which is here so clearly commenced but imperfectly developed? 'Our knowledge of God is not full at first, but every grain of experience becomes material for fuller knowledge of Him.' 'This view,' remarks our author, 'has special affinity with Christian Theism, because it is itself in essence a Theory of Knowledge in which the finite sphere is regarded as a Revelation' (p. 36). This remark is just, and suffices to prove the relevancy of the Philosophy of Religion to any effective dealing with the unbelief of our time. But at a later page the author gives a wholesome warning against the danger of substituting a system of thought, however much sanctioned by modern philosophy, and however capable of an use resembling the Christian, for that simple faith in 'the Person and Work of our Incarnate Lord by which the heart of the world has been won' (p. 42).

One more type we shall name: that of Ethical Theism in which the moral argument for Theism is stated independently. Professor Caldecott is careful to state that the ideal must be ever before us if we would use this argument with effect. It rests upon our sense of moral duty and our admiration of moral goodness; either of which conceptions appeals to our active nature and calls our will into play. And he believes that for want of dwelling on the fact that a sense of imperfection attends our answer to ethical appeals, the moral

argument has often been used without its full effect. It is indeed a noteworthy fact to be observed in this world that, among the things which are made, such ideas as that of law or of righteous obedience should exist: of all the effects which specially require an adequate cause to account for them these are among the most striking. But this is cold argument in comparison to that which can be used to a moral being in the very time that his moral consciousness is in action. The distinction which our author draws between the previous type and the present is this: that the one 'plants itself in the sphere of knowledge, the other in the sphere of conduct.' They both undoubtedly originate in Kant. But to some followers of Kant it has seemed that their master was unwillingly obliged to allow that the work of conscience did show a remainder of knowledge in man's mind after the havoc which the Kantian system had made in all man's other boasted mental forces; while to others the unwillingness of this moral and spiritual concession of the great philosopher has seemed quite imaginary, and the confidence with which he uses the great fact of our moral responsibility and freedom, and the source of them in God, is full compensation for all the humiliation to which our pride of reason has been forced to submit. However distinct the methods of regarding the work of Kant may be, it would seem to us that they admit of combination. The spirituality and the wide extension of Ethical and Theistic influences in nature belong properly to the system of Kant, which without them is deprived of its proper meaning and power.

The limits of this notice do not allow of our further pursuit of the list of types which compose Professor Caldecott's first part. They number thirteen upon the whole. We shall not claim to have noted the more important of them, save upon the ground that they are those to which the author has devoted the larger space. Certain it is that the whole list is well deserving of thoughtful perusal.

The second part is historical, and fills the larger and more interesting portion of the work. It furnishes a careful notice of each individual writer whose views the introductory part has classified.

Among all the treatises which are thus called under review and treated with fair and scientific criticism, there is none which meets with higher appreciation than that on the *Philosophy of Religion*, by the late Dr. Caird, of Glasgow. It falls under type 3, which, as above described, includes the school of Transcendental Theism. 'Man,' says Dr. Caird, 'has relations to other finite beings, but also to that which transcends the finite.' This Infinite has then to be examined, and it is plain that its nature is that of Spirit. This is what religion means by the Infinite. It is this idea of it which 'is simply the idea of God as Absolute Spirit.' 'It is of extreme importance,' comments Professor Caldecott, 'to observe that by Spirit Caird undoubtedly means Mind' (p. 147). 'Here is the bed-rock of Caird's *Philosophy of Religion*. . . This secured, his Moral Idealism follows. . . The theological bearing of Moral Idealism arises in the need of an Infinite Spirit to support the ideal of

finite spirits' (p. 148). Professor Caldecott's method is judicial, and he does not unreservedly adopt any one of the systems which he reviews. But he concludes his notice of Dr. John Caird's book by exhorting the reader to study its two constructive chapters on the Speculative Idea and the Moral Life, and promises him that he will 'feel Idealism to be one of the modes of Theism which the British mind as well as the German can conceive, expound, and invest with attractive and impressive character' (p. 150). And favourable judgments of a similar character upon this type are found in the notices which follow upon the works of Dr. Edward Caird, Professor Green, and Mr. T. B. Strong.

Personal interest in Cardinal Newman obliges one to turn to Dr. Caldecott's criticism of his view of the subject, as contained in the *Grammar of Assent*. It is classed as Personal Theism, and is this: that the whole personality of man acts in judging, and is concerned in assent; that in religion we have to do with living realities, the soul of man and God, and that in this matter abstract reasoning is not the source of assent. Reasoning can but contribute some 'notions' upon which the majority reflect very little, though the theologian sets them in order. It would seem that these notions set down in contrast to the real personal assent of actual life are proofs to which the Roman system requires consent. But that question need not be argued. Dr. Newman's emphasis upon the power of conscience would lead Dr. Caldecott to class him in the Ethical School. But this would not satisfy the Cardinal himself. His belief, strong and practical as it was, was of a character so personal that it hardly yields any rule applicable to all; 'it is really a psychology of how assents are reached, not how they should be' (p. 268). That, doubtless, is a true character of Cardinal Newman's system, which many others, as well as he, carried out in his life. And it reminds us of our duty to keep in health that combination of moral, mental, and physical life by which our assents are reached, whether they should be so reached or not.

We should have wished to describe some more of Professor Caldecott's criticism, especially perhaps that upon Dr. Martineau, whose well-known works are found difficult to classify under any of the types (pp. 343, 347). The solution of the difficulty is found by our author in the view that Dr. Martineau as he proceeds introduces a feature of Theism which he had not at first included in his theory, namely, an intuitive apprehension of the Divine Being. The solution seems to us highly probable; and, coupling it with the question how Professor Knight is to be classed (p. 104 n.), and that above noticed regarding Dr. Newman, we should be disposed to believe that there must be some common element in all real religions, and that what the author calls his 'comparative method' (p. 349) may at times miss it. Nevertheless, it is hard to suggest any clear principle of classification except that which Dr. Caldecott has adopted, and the book is one of very great value to students of religion.

History of Intellectual Development on the Lines of Modern Evolution. By JOHN BEATTIE CROZIER. Vol. III. Political, Educational, Social : including an attempted reconstruction of the politics of England, France, and America, for the twentieth century. (London : Longmans, 1901.)

DR. CROZIER's title is sufficiently ambitious, including even prophecy. But former acquaintance (see *Church Quarterly Review*, July, 1899) led us to expect much ability in his present volume : nor have we been disappointed. Before any criticism, however, we must express our unfeigned regret that this is Vol. III. of a work Vol. II. of which has not yet appeared : the dislocation being due to doubts whether the eyesight of the author is equal to the amount of minute research which a history of European civilization between the Fall of the Roman Empire and the present would have entailed.

However, this misfortune does not seem to afford the author as much trouble as we might have feared. He expresses his belief that those whom the arguments of Vol. III. fail to convince would hardly have yielded to the more extended support which Vol. II. would have adduced for them. And this leads us to wonder whether the line of Modern Evolution can be very strictly drawn. Modern Evolution is a strange phrase. It can hardly imply that Evolution has only begun to operate in modern times : it must mean something essential in human history at all times. Therefore it is surprising that the omission of a period which must include so much of the data of our present condition should not only make no difference to the readers of the author's estimate of the present and the future, but should not cause any hesitation as to its correctness in the mind of the author himself. Historians who wrote in the unenlightened period before Evolution came to rule in all departments never failed to recognize a certain connexion in human affairs. Modern Evolution cannot include much more than the general sense which all serious thinkers have always entertained, that what men sow they reap, if so much of the history of the sowing can be omitted without any difference caused in our expectations of reaping.

Our readers will doubtless think it natural that no part of Dr. Crozier's account of past evolution or expectations of the future should interest us more than those which concern religion. They do not impress us as deeply founded. The author seems to us to have extended over the whole area of Christian history certain observations of his own, striking enough in their own sphere, but not of the character to indicate eras in human evolution. He has seen the Calvinistic Theology in which he was nurtured eaten away to a hollow shell ; the Puritan Sabbaths, the belief in Predestination and Hell-fire all gone—to use his expression, which is far too forcible even in reference to these things—as a nightmare and a hideous dream.¹ He has seen the marriage bond and its chastity come within a generation to be as lightly esteemed as if it were a change of garment from which we could as lightly change back again if it did not suit. Dr.

¹ Page 21.

Crozier himself expresses his sense of the social anomaly of such so-called modern evolutions, 'as if when the Religion that gave life to this sanctity of marriage and kept it pure were withdrawn you had only to reach out your hand and rekindle it again.'¹

That is a great mistake. But Dr. Crozier commits a similar error in his estimate of the Ideals of past Christian history: what they were and how they came and changed. If the materials of his second volume had been before him it might have abated the confidence with which he characterises successive eras of the faith as the Christian Spiritual Ideal, the Mediæval Ascetic Ideal, and the Reformation Moral Ideal. The Christian Spiritual Ideal 'in its original fulness and integrity' meant, it seems, that the world was coming to an end and the kingdom of heaven close at hand. And the command to give one's cloak as well as one's coat when asked for was, it seems, quite natural and proper for such an Ideal. But it was merely what the world wanted as a heaven to work on its imagination so as to turn the pagan relation of master and slave to the Christian one of human brotherhood.

But who can believe that the expectation that the kingdom of heaven was at hand expressed the Ideal of primitive Christianity? It silently vanished from the Christian consciousness without harm done to any mind. Or that this place was held by the precept to give cloak as well as coat? Even in the earliest times that seems to have been explained as a strong word of the Master, characteristic as well of His parabolic method of teaching as of His charity and submission. No expectation of the future or precept of conduct assumed the position of an Ideal for the primitive Christian, even if he were more certain of the expectation or more confirmed in the literal practice than in either of these cases can be shown to have been the case. Faith in Jesus Christ, the Son of God, Who had come into the world from heaven and was now gone back to heaven, was the distinctive belief of the early convert: spiritual union with the Lord Jesus and obedience to His precepts and promises constituted the Christian Ideal. It is difficult to understand how any reader of the New Testament, gospels or epistles, could name any other Ideal of the primitive life but this; and it did not cease to be the Ideal of Christians even when it ceased to be as well realised as it had been in the first generations of the Church.

When we pass into mediæval times we do not find Celibacy and Asceticism adopted as independent Ideals, or regarded as ends of life even when the evil of the times produced the largest exaggeration of their merits. They were forms of the Imitation of Christ or surrenders of earthly ties for the sake of carrying forward His work in the world or securing His place in the soul. In those very times the sacramental nature of the marriage tie was asserted with the utmost emphasis. The supernatural held its own in the very midst of the natural life.

Nor can it be said that the Ideal of Christianity changed at the

¹ Page 22.

Reformation. It is a very doubtful matter whether Morality became the Ideal of Christians who adopted the Reformation more than of those who refused it. The Bible acquired no higher reputation of abstract infallibility than the unreformed Church had given and gives it. It was but this, that when the practical guidance of the soul by the Church ceased to satisfy, the Bible was brought forward to supply the vacant place. The formula of faith in Scripture remained the same for Roman Catholics and Protestants; but the same formula had a varying import for those who accepted the Church's guidance and for those who used their own judgment. Dr. Crozier's Ideals do not seem ever to have possessed the importance which he supposes to have been assigned them. Something more important than any of the peculiarities which we see in the various ages of the Church was common to them all, namely, the faith and following of Jesus Christ. And if, as the author proposes, 'we take religion and those codes of morality which have grown out of its creeds,' we find that faith and following to be the Ideal of Christian civilisation still.

But call them how we may, men's ideals have not ruled them alone nor will they rule them in the future. The path of civilisation, according to our author, has run in past times between the rule of the Ideal upon one side and physical force on the other. By physical force is meant not the powers of nature but feudal or such-like human exertion of physical strength. It is the work of civilization, so far as it may have been attained, to reconcile force and the ideal by alternate expostulation. A chart of civilization for the future guidance of the statesmen who are to influence the future is a great desideratum with our author. It would be indeed a difficult chart to draw: feudalism was mixed with the ideal and *vice versa* as they worked in the past, and it would be hard to use for guidance a chart in which civilization should be represented as 'posting zig-zag backwards and forwards.'

Nor, indeed, is it the office of a chart for the steersman of the future that the record of the past is intended to perform. It is intended to prick and let escape whatever is gaseous and unsound and unreal about the Ideals, and to temper them duly with their opposites in the physical forces. The author is well aware how defective is the guidance or power in the future which statesmen are likely to derive from the evolution of the past. For he thinks it well we should realise 'how large is the realm of human affairs which is beyond either human insight or control, and which must be for ever left in the hands of Providence or Fate. Or say rather of Providence . . . If the Evolution of Civilization is a definite and not an erratic or chaotic movement, and if the evolution of the human spirit is also definite and not erratic or chaotic, the other factor, namely, Fate, which unites with the human mind in the production of this orderly movement of civilisation must be definite also and not erratic or chaotic, that is to say, it must be a Providence and not a blind Fate' (pp. 136-137).

True indeed: therefore the evolution of the twentieth century must not set aside trust in God or prayer to Him.

Francis and Dominic and the Mendicant Orders. By JOHN HERKLESS, D.D., Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the University of St. Andrews. (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1901.)

PROFESSOR HERKLESS has given a very compact and readable account of St. Francis and St. Dominic, and of the Mendicant Orders which they founded. He is not only fair, but in the main appreciative. In fact, the only thing we notice from this point of view is inability to understand the wonderful hold which the constant use of the offices and celebrations of the Church has on the spiritual mind. That, of course, is only natural if the thing is viewed from the outside. The book, however, is a good summary of the ground it covers. We have first of all succinct accounts of the lives of St. Francis and St. Dominic. Then a chapter on the progress of the orders. Then follow two chapters of great interest and importance: one on the relation of the Orders to the Inquisition, and the other on their relation to Scholasticism. And, lastly, there is a chapter on the degradation of the Orders.

The great religious movement, of which the foundation of the two Orders is the manifestation, is one of the most remarkable in the history of the Church. And yet it is difficult to characterize it in a brief statement. There are so many different points of view from which it may be regarded; and then inside the Church and the Orders there are so many changes of aspect that one gets confused, and has to confess that the outcome is wholly different from the beginning. Yet in a general way it may be said that in its inception the movement was the reaction within the Church against the great Hildebrandine movement which preceded it.

If one looks at the inner life of the Hildebrandine movement and the great motives and aims which animated Gregory VII., and those who surrounded him, there is much in them to command our deepest respect. Their aim was the freedom of the Church from external constraint and its purification from worldliness. Unhappily they did not take into consideration the weakness of human nature, and how far it might be practically possible to realize the high ends at which they aimed. Nor did they anticipate that the movement originated by them from the highest motives might be carried on by successors who were animated by motives of a different order. The result was that in the course of a century the Church, instead of being purified and elevated, was in a far worse position in respect of worldliness than it was before.

The two great evils with which they waged war were simony, or the corrupt appointment to benefices, and the marriage of the clergy. Simony was to be completely uprooted even to the destruction of such legitimate influence as the emperors might claim in the appointment of high dignitaries who were not only great ecclesiastical authorities but great lords of state. In a great measure they succeeded in this, though they could hardly anticipate that simony banished from the sphere of the laity would take a much firmer root in the Curia itself and give rise to greater evils. Then as to the

marri
viewe
But
great
depic
lead
spirit
life.
sanct
more
T
and
ings
patri
by th
The
wealt
clergy
laxity
the F
and
We k
But
office
was t
laity.
testif
tells
witho
days
again
living
carele
out F
T
uride
in fav
state
peopl
of all
absol
whic
This
exam
the p
Dant
bride
in pi
longe
repro

marriage of the clergy. No doubt marriage in the clergy might be viewed as an inferior spiritual state, or even as a form of worldliness. But then how far was its abolition practicable without introducing greater evils—evils such as those which Peter Damiani so graphically depicts as existing all around? In fact, its abolition so far from leading to a higher spiritual life tended very much to destroy spirituality. There are other forms of worldliness besides a married life. And in the case of the clergy, worldliness banished from the sanctities of family life assumed a form which in the end was far more disastrous to the Church.

The intense faith which pervaded all Europe during the tenth and eleventh centuries led to a superabundance of gifts and offerings to the Church. The Pope received the magnificent gift of the patrimony of the Countess Matilda, and similar gifts were received by the great dignitaries, the Bishops and abbots throughout Europe. The Church acquired immense wealth. And this possession of wealth exercised a disastrous effect upon the spiritual life of the clergy. It led to worldly pomp and display, and to a corresponding laxity in the performance of the duties of their office. The court of the Pope rivalled that of the emperor, and similarly the great Bishops and abbots rivalled in pomp and state the princes of the Empire. We know not how far down this worldliness and display descended. But benefices were accumulated in the hands of a few, and the offices of the Church left to hirelings. The consequence of this was the neglect of pastoral duties and a widespread alienation of the laity. A state of things originated which, had not St. Bernard testified to it, we could hardly have believed. The churches, he tells us, were without people, the people without priests, the priests without respect, the sacraments were no longer sacred, and the holy days without their solemnities. The mind of the people revolted against this state of things, and that which came home to them as a living scandal was the wealth and worldliness of the clergy and their carelessness in the performance of their duties. A cry arose throughout Europe for holiness and poverty.

Then began the reaction within the Church. And if we would understand aright the wail of soul and the piteous cry of St. Francis in favour of poverty, we must contemplate him in view of the above state of things. The Church was degraded and the souls of the people were perishing because of riches. He would divest himself of all his possessions and go after the souls that were perishing in absolute poverty. It is clear that this cry for poverty struck a note which resounded deeply in the hearts of the people of that time. This is evident not only from the multitudes which imitated his example and were associated with him, but from the way in which the poetry and art of the period took up the theme. The lines of Dante in which he celebrates the marriage of St. Francis with the bride Poverty are well known, and the marriage was also represented in pictorial art. But it was not poverty simply that St. Francis longed for. It was holy poverty—the poverty of Christ. He would reproduce in himself not only poverty, but all the beauteous features

which made up the image of the Saviour, and in that guise would plead with the people.

It was the same with St. Dominic, though in his case the poverty was embraced not so much with the enthusiasm and burning love of St. Francis, but with the colder, though not less decided, verdict of the intellect. It is related of St. Dominic that, when returning with the Spanish Bishop of Osma through Languedoc, he encountered the Papal Legates sent forth to deal with the heretics. The legates were travelling in all the pomp and state of high ecclesiastics of the period, and they complained of their want of success. St. Dominic at once perceived where the fault lay, and he and the Bishop advised them to dismiss their retinue and continue their mission without any external show. In order to give an example the Bishop of Osma sent away his followers and retained only St. Dominic. They preached and recovered many from heresy; but the evil had spread too far to be overcome.

St. Francis is a beautiful character, though unhappily the details of the great spiritual process through which he passed are but scanty. The reader will find the most of what remains collected in the author's book. St. Francis's first idea was not to found an Order, but, in company with others like-minded, to go to the people and preach Christ to them. It was found, however, necessary to begin an Order, and Papal sanction had to be got for it. It was in this that all the Franciscan difficulties originated. The problem was how to reconcile the ideal of absolute poverty with the worldly necessities of a great Order. Probably the ideal of St. Francis was too spiritual and elevated to be carried out practically. But he contended earnestly for absolute poverty, and with him the large section of his followers who were termed the Spirituals. The actual constitution arranged by Cardinal Ugolini, afterwards Gregory IX., was a compromise between poverty and worldly necessity. It was a stumbling-block to the Spirituals and gave occasion to long years of contention. It is a sad history.

The same difficulties did not arise in respect of St. Dominic. While St. Francis's great ideal was holy poverty and a burning love for souls, St. Dominic's was devotion to the Church and its faith. St. Dominic had studied theology for many years before he went forth on his great mission. He was pre-eminently a theologian, and this, his character, was deeply impressed upon his followers. It was thus no difficult matter to fashion the Dominican Order into a powerful support of the Papal system. Both Orders were much given to preaching, but it is characteristic that, while St. Francis and his followers sought out the poor and the ignorant, St. Dominic directed his efforts to the higher classes.

The progress of both Orders is most remarkable. In a brief period both had spread over the whole of Europe and had even penetrated the East and Africa. The author devotes a chapter to this progress, and then proceeds to consider the relation in which both stood to the Inquisition. This is a sad subject. The Inquisition is without exception the most heartrending feature in the whole

history
crusad
Pope
of his
the se
it was
devast
about
forms
fright
death
form a
tion c
a seri
conne
Inquis
to the
had h
living
recoil
passed
Church
Roma
ing ;
Pio N
infer
inquis
the R
Catto
della
It
which
tude o
numb
all the
place
To th
Scotu
Domi
St. T
each
hard
Univ
by th
St. T
day t
was d
and o
the g
mom

history of the Church. Previous to its establishment there was the crusade against the Albigenses. It is sad to think that the great Pope Innocent III. was the cause of this. At the commencement of his career in a series of bulls he stirred up, and almost coerced, the secular powers in the neighbourhood to undertake it. And when it was carried out it was with unheard of cruelty, slaughter, and devastation. It failed, however, in suppressing the heresy; and about the year 1227 the Inquisition was established. Its iniquitous forms of procedure, confounding the innocent with the guilty, the frightful tortures to which it subjected the accused, and the cruel death of burning alive, which was the fate of the condemned, all form a series which it stuns us to contemplate. The present generation cannot regard it otherwise than as being, from beginning to end, a series of crimes against humanity. Unhappily, the Orders were connected with it. For the most part the Dominicans were the Inquisitors; but the Franciscans also were engaged in it, though not to the same extent. We wonder how St. Francis would have felt had he lived to witness it. He who felt a Divine pity for every living thing, and addressed the swallows as sisters, must surely have recoiled from it. We know the judgment St. Ambrose would have passed upon it, and he probably voiced the general feeling of the Church of his day. That being so, we would fain believe that our Roman brethren would with ourselves reprobate the whole proceeding; but there are difficulties in the way. We cannot forget that Pio Nono, in condemning in the Syllabus the proposition *Ecclesia vis inferendæ potestatem non habet*, virtually revived the principle of inquisition and punishment. Nor are the utterances of parties within the Roman Church to be overlooked. Many years ago the *Civiltà Cattolica*, writing of the Inquisition, called it *un sublime spettacolo della perfezione sociale*.

It is a great relief to turn from the Inquisition to the relation in which the Orders stood to Scholasticism. Nothing shows the magnitude of the influence which they exerted so much as the fact of the number of great men they attracted to themselves. In fact, almost all the outstanding names who, in the thirteenth century, found their place in the temple of fame belonged to one or other of the Orders. To the Franciscans belong Alexander of Hales, Buonaventura, Duns Scotus, Roger Bacon, and William of Occam. The Order of St. Dominic was illustrated by the great names of Albertus Magnus and St. Thomas Aquinas. The author has given particulars regarding each of these and the work which they accomplished. They had a hard fight to attain their position in the universities, especially in the University of Paris; but they justified the victory which they obtained by the greatness of their work. Among them all shines resplendent St. Thomas, who, in theology, has maintained down to the present day the great place that he at once attained. St. Thomas, one can see, was deeply studied by our great English Divines, Hooker, Pearson, and others. The only regrettable thing connected with his labours is the great fraud which was practised on him, which had such momentous consequences. An account of this is given in *Janus*,

English translation, p. 261. How deeply Dr. Döllinger felt this, in view of its results, was evidenced in conversations in which he repeatedly recurred to it.

After the chapter on Scholasticism comes the concluding chapter on the degradation of the Orders. The author's book will be welcome to all those who in a brief space wish for a knowledge of the subject. One thing to be regretted we may mention. He gives no proper table of contents, nor the references to the quotations he makes. This is a great defect. In these days when there is so much to be read in reference to every subject, the absence of a table of contents is a serious blemish. It involves on the part of the student the hunting at large for information to which he might be directed at a glance. We hope these defects may be made good in a second edition.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

The Historical New Testament. By JAMES MOFFATT, B.D. Second Edition. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 16s.) The first edition of this work was reviewed in the *Church Quarterly Review* for April of the present year (Vol. lii. p. 238) and we have not space to discuss it further. We will only suggest that it is somewhat unbecoming in a writer who, however industrious, has no pretensions to be a distinguished scholar, to speak with contempt of others merely because they date works somewhat earlier than he does. Professor Blass's opinion on the date of the Acts may not be correct, but by what right is it called preposterous? Mr. Moffatt is willing to make use of Dr. Lock's scholarship to revise his translation of the Pastoral Epistles. Will he describe his argument about them as 'proofs of the ingenuity of exegetical despair rather than of historical investigation'?

The Works of George Berkeley, D.D.; formerly Bishop of Cloyne. By ALEXANDER CAMPBELL FRASER. (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press. 4 vols. 24s.) Professor Fraser's edition of Bishop Berkeley's works is well known. The impression having been exhausted, a new edition has been called for, and Professor Fraser has given us what is in some ways 'a new work.' It would be difficult to have the writings of the most fascinating and suggestive of English thinkers in a more attractive form.

Guild Text Books. Edited by the Very Rev. Professor CHARTERIS, D.D., LL.D. Edinburgh, and the Rev. J. A. MCCLYNANT, D.D. Aberdeen. *Studies in the Acts of the Apostles.* By the Rev. WILLIAM ROBERTSON, M.A. (London: A. & C. Black. 6d.) This guild text book contains a simple and straightforward account of the narrative of the Acts, and will be found useful for its purpose.

Handbook to Judges and Ruth, for the use of teachers and students. By the Rev. G. H. S. WALPOLE, D.D., Principal of Bede College, Durham. (London: Rivingtons, 2s. 6d.) This is a useful analysis and handbook for the use of National Schools. The work is well

done.
lower

A
(Oxf
Pp. x
the st
minis
of O
partly

A
CORB
of sto
or thi
made

R
FREE
Skeff
which

T
of Rh
This
found
well l
of Ec
made

T
of Re
Britis
histor

Fr
intere
those

TH
every
July
H. A.
the F
Advoc
Mean
by the
Notes
corrob
ordain

TH
numb

done. But surely such books should be published nowadays at a lower price than 2s. 6d.

Manual of the Four Gospels. By the Rev. T. H. STOKOE, D.D. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1901. Part I., 2s.; Part II., 2s. Pp. xx + 376.) These two volumes form excellent text books for the study of the narrative. Part I. gives a general account of the ministry put together from the four Gospels. Part II. gives an account of Our Lord's teaching, arranged partly in chronological order, partly according to subjects.

A Thousand Things to say in Sermons. By the Rev. F. ST. JOHN CORBETT, M.A. (London: Skeffington & Son. 5s.) A collection of stories and extracts, to save the clergy the trouble of reading or thinking, which some may find useful, and which is not badly made.

Religious and Social Work amongst Girls. By FLORA LUCY FREEMAN, with prefatory letter by Rev. R. R. DOLLING. (London: Skeffington & Son. 2s. 6d.) This is a useful and sensible book which may help inexperienced workers.

The British South Africa Company. Reports of the Administration of Rhodesia, 1898-1900. Printed for the information of shareholders. This collection of reports is full of interest, and suggests that the foundations of what we hope may be important countries are being well laid. We hope we may hereafter return to some of the questions of Ecclesiastical organisation and Education. An attempt has been made to solve the problems of religious education with perfect fairness.

The Story of the (Osmanli) Turkish Version, with a brief account of Related Versions. By the Rev. A. A. COOPER, M.A. (London: British and Foreign Bible Society, 6d.) Contains an account of the history of the translation of the Bible into Turkish.

From the S.P.C.K. we have received a number of useful and interesting tracts, more particularly a series of tracts and leaflets for those who have to work in lunatic asylums.

REVIEWS AND MAGAZINES.

The Journal of Theological Studies is absolutely indispensable to every serious theological student in this country. The number for July has articles on the 'English Coronation Orders,' by the Rev. H. A. Wilson; 'The Relation of Miracles to Christian Doctrine,' by the Rev. Herbert Kelly, S.S.M.; 'Did the Corinthian Church Advocate Universal Marriage?' by John Massie; and 'The Use and Meaning of the Phrase "The Son of Man" in the Synoptic Gospels,' by the Rev. James Drummond, LL.D. The most important of the Notes is one by E. W. Brooks and the Editor on two passages corroborating the tradition that in Alexandria the Bishop was ordained by Presbyters.

The Critical Review. (July and September.) The September number contains interesting reviews of Father Pullen's *The Primitive*

Saints and the See of Rome and Canon Gore's *Body of Christ*. They are worth studying for the sake of noting how far the reviewers agree with and how far they differ from the writers.

The *Edinburgh Review* (July, 1901) contains an interesting and powerfully-written article on the life and work of Leo Nicholas-vitch Tolstoy. We feel that the writer has a full appreciation of the remarkable character with which he is dealing. In the same *Review* is an article on the 'Time-Spirit of the Nineteenth Century,' based on Mr. Balfour's address on the Nineteenth Century, showing how this century differs from others in its 'changed point of view,' due to the development of science. The 'individualistic theory of the rights of man' has been replaced by that of 'humanity as a developing organism,' and the writer points out that the change will probably prove advantageous to the cause of Christianity.

The *Empire Review*. (August, 1901.) 'Our National Bible,' by Sir William Muir, K.C.S.I. The article is an able review of J. W. Hoare's *Evolution of the Bible*, a book which we considered at length in our last number. In the same *Review* for September 'The State and Christian Missions,' by the Bishop of Calcutta, shows the advantage which would result from the co-operation of the Government with Christian Missions. The article contains practical suggestions for the organization of missions.

The *English Historical Review* of July (1901) begins with a short but appreciative article on Bishop Stubbs by Professor Maitland.

In the *Economic Review* (July 1901) is an article by the Rev. Hugh Legge, in which the difficulties attending the education of the poorer classes are forcibly stated.

In the *Contemporary Review* for August and September 1901 we notice an article headed 'Anthropology and the Evolution of Religion,' by the Rev. W. W. Peyton. It is rather to be regretted that the writer's animadversions on recent eccentricities of anthropologists are couched in such flowery language as to deprive them of most of their intelligibility and of their value. In the September number of this *Review* is an article on the 'Organization of Mankind,' by E. Wake Cook, which deserves attention. He dwells on the brotherhood of mankind and the providential direction of the universe.

In the *Monthly Review*, Father Gerard's 'A Jesuit Plea for Jesuits' is likely to be much read, though it may be doubted if many will be convinced. It receives a reply in the October number.

CH

1. Th
- I
2. Th
- (S
3. Lib
- E
4. Mo
- M
5. Mi
- ty
- F
- I
6. Th
- th
- A
- (I
7. Th
- (I
8. En
- W

THE s
the En
ecclesi
service
VOL